NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCIX.

FEBRUARY 15, 1907.

CHAPTERS FROM MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY.—XII.*

BY MARK TWAIN.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Mr. Clemens began to write his autobiography many years ago, and he continues to add to it day by day. It was his original intention to permit no publication of his memoirs until after his death; but, after leaving "Pier No. 70," he concluded that a considerable portion might now suitably be given to the public. It is that portion, garnered from the quarter-million of words already written, which will appear in this REVIEW during the coming year. No part of the autobiography will be published in book form during the lifetime of the author.—EDITOR N. A. R.

Orion Clemens—resumed.

[*Dictated April 5, 1906.*] There were several candidates for all the offices in the gift of the new State of Nevada save two—United States Senator, and Secretary of State. Nye was certain to get a Senatorship, and Orion was so sure to get the Secretaryship that no one but him was named for that office. But he was hit with one of his spasms of virtue on the very day that the Republican party was to make its nominations in the Convention, and refused to go near the Convention. He was urged, but all persuasions failed. He said his presence there would be an unfair and improper influence and that if he was to be nominated the compliment must come to

(1864-5.)

*Copyright, 1906, by HARPER & BROTHERS. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright, 1907, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him as a free and unspotted gift. This attitude would have settled his case for him without further effort, but he had another attack of virtue on the same day, that made it absolutely sure. It had been his habit for a great many years to change his religion with his shirt, and his ideas about temperance at the same time. He would be a teetotaler for a while and the champion of the cause; then he would change to the other side for a time. On nomination day he suddenly changed from a friendly attitude toward whiskey—which was the popular attitude—to uncompromising teetotalism, and went absolutely dry. His friends besought and implored, but all in vain. He could not be persuaded to cross the threshold of a saloon. The paper next morning contained the list of chosen nominees. His name was not in it. He had not received a vote.

His rich income ceased when the State government came into power. He was without an occupation. Something had to be done. He put up his sign as attorney-at-law, but he got no clients. It was strange. It was difficult to account for. I cannot account for it—but if I were going to guess at a solution I should guess that by the make of him he would examine both sides of a case so diligently and so conscientiously that when he got through with his argument neither he nor a jury would know which side he was on. I think that his client would find out his make in laying his case before him, and would take warning and withdraw it in time to save himself from probable disaster.

I had taken up my residence in San Francisco about a year before the time I have just been speaking of. One day I got a tip from Mr. Camp, a bold man who was always making big fortunes in ingenious speculations and losing them again in the course of six months by other speculative ingenuities. Camp told me to buy some shares in the Hale and Norcross. I bought fifty shares at three hundred dollars a share. I bought on a margin, and put up twenty per cent. It exhausted my funds. I wrote Orion and offered him half, and asked him to send his share of the money. I waited and waited. He wrote and said he was going to attend to it. The stock went along up pretty briskly. It went higher and higher. It reached a thousand dollars a share. It climbed to two thousand, then to three thousand; then to twice that figure. The money did not come, but I was not disturbed. By and by that stock took a turn and began to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gallop down. Then I wrote urgently. Orion answered that he had sent the money long ago—said he had sent it to the Occidental Hotel. I inquired for it. They said it was not there. To cut a long story short, that stock went on down until it fell below the price I had paid for it. Then it began to eat up the margin, and when at last I got out I was very badly crippled.

When it was too late, I found out what had become of Orion's money. Any other human being would have sent a check, but he sent gold. The hotel clerk put it in the safe and went on vacation, and there it had reposed all this time enjoying its fatal work, no doubt. Another man might have thought to tell me that the money was not in a letter, but was in an express package, but it never occurred to Orion to do that.

Later, Mr. Camp gave me another chance. He agreed to buy our Tennessee land for two hundred thousand dollars, pay a part of the amount in cash and give long notes for the rest. His scheme was to import foreigners from grape-growing and wine-making districts in Europe, settle them on the land, and turn it into a wine-growing country. He knew what Mr. Longworth thought of those Tennessee grapes, and was satisfied. I sent the contracts and things to Orion for his signature, he being one of the three heirs. But they arrived at a bad time—in a doubly bad time, in fact. The temperance virtue was temporarily upon him in strong force, and he wrote and said that he would not be a party to debauching the country with wine. Also he said how could he know whether Mr. Camp was going to deal fairly and honestly with those poor people from Europe or not?—and so, without waiting to find out, he quashed the whole trade, and there it fell, never to be brought to life again. The land, from being suddenly worth two hundred thousand dollars, became as suddenly worth what it was before—nothing, and taxes to pay. I had paid the taxes and the other expenses for some years, but I dropped the Tennessee land there, and have never taken any interest in it since, pecuniarily or otherwise, until yesterday.

I had supposed, until yesterday, that Orion had frittered away the last acre, and indeed that was his own impression. But a gentleman arrived yesterday from Tennessee and brought a map showing that by a correction of the ancient surveys we still own a thousand acres, in a coal district, out of the hundred thousand acres which my father left us when he died in 1847. The gen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tleman brought a proposition; also he brought a reputable and well-to-do citizen of New York. The proposition was that the Tennesseean gentleman should sell that land; that the New York gentleman should pay all the expenses and fight all the law-suits, in case any should turn up, and that of such profit as might eventuate the Tennesseean gentleman should take a third, the New-Yorker a third, and Sam Moffett and his sister and I—who are surviving heirs—the remaining third.

This time I hope we shall get rid of the Tennessee land for good and all and never hear of it again.

I came East in January, 1867. Orion remained in Carson City perhaps a year longer. Then he sold his twelve-thousand-dollar house and its furniture for thirty-five hundred in green-backs at about sixty per cent. discount. He and his wife took passage in the steamer for home in Keokuk. About 1871 or '72 they came to New York. Orion had been trying to make a living in the law ever since he had arrived from the Pacific Coast, but he had secured only two cases. Those he was to try free of charge—but the possible result will never be known, because the parties settled the cases out of court without his help.

(1867.)

(1871.)

Orion got a job as proof-reader on the New York "Evening Post" at ten dollars a week. By and by he came to Hartford and wanted me to get him a place as reporter on a Hartford paper. Here was a chance to try my scheme again, and I did it. I made him go to the Hartford "Evening Post," without any letter of introduction, and propose to scrub and sweep and do all sorts of things for nothing, on the plea that he didn't need money but only needed work, and that that was what he was pining for. Within six weeks he was on the editorial staff of that paper at twenty dollars a week, and he was worth the money. He was presently called for by some other paper at better wages, but I made him go to the "Post" people and tell them about it. They stood the raise and kept him. It was the pleasantest berth he had ever had in his life. It was an easy berth. He was in every way comfortable. But ill-luck came. It was bound to come.

A new Republican daily was to be started in a New England city by a stock company of well-to-do politicians, and they offered him the chief editorship at three thousand a year. He was eager

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to accept. My beseechings and reasonings went for nothing. I said,

"You are as weak as water. Those people will find it out right away. They will easily see that you have no backbone; that they can deal with you as they would deal with a slave. You may last six months, but not longer. Then they will not dismiss you as they would dismiss a gentleman: they will fling you out as they would fling out an intruding tramp."

It happened just so. Then he and his wife migrated to Keokuk once more. Orion wrote from there that he was not resuming the law; that he thought that what his health needed was the open air, in some sort of outdoor occupation; that his father-in-law had a strip of ground on the river border a mile above Keokuk with some sort of a house on it, and his idea was to buy that place and start a chicken-farm and provide Keokuk with chickens and eggs, and perhaps butter—but I don't know whether you can raise butter on a chicken-farm or not. He said the place could be had for three thousand dollars cash, and I sent the money. He began to raise chickens, and he made a detailed monthly report to me, whereby it appeared that he was able to work off his chickens on the Keokuk people at a dollar and a quarter a pair. But it also appeared that it cost a dollar and sixty cents to raise the pair. This did not seem to discourage Orion, and so I let it go. Meantime he was borrowing a hundred dollars per month of me regularly, month by month. Now to show Orion's stern and rigid business ways—and he really prided himself on his large business capacities—the moment he received the advance of a hundred dollars at the beginning of each month, he always sent me his note for the amount, and with it he sent, *out of that money, three months' interest* on the hundred dollars at six per cent. per annum, these notes being always for three months.

As I say, he always sent a detailed statement of the month's profit and loss on the chickens—at least the month's loss on the chickens—and this detailed statement included the various items of expense—corn for the chickens, boots for himself, and so on; even car fares, and the weekly contribution of ten cents to help out the missionaries who were trying to damn the Chinese after a plan not satisfactory to those people.

I think the poultry experiment lasted about a year, possibly two years. It had then cost me six thousand dollars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Orion returned to the law business, and I suppose he remained in that harness off and on for the succeeding quarter of a century, but so far as my knowledge goes he was only a lawyer in name, and had no clients.

My mother died, in her eighty-eighth year, in the summer of 1890. She had saved some money, and she left it to me, (1890.) because it had come from me. I gave it to Orion and he said, with thanks, that I had supported him long enough and now he was going to relieve me of that burden, and would also hope to pay back some of that expense, and maybe the whole of it. Accordingly, he proceeded to use up that money in building a considerable addition to the house, with the idea of taking boarders and getting rich. We need not dwell upon this venture. It was another of his failures. His wife tried hard to make the scheme succeed, and if anybody could have made it succeed she would have done it. She was a good woman, and was greatly liked. She had a practical side, and she would have made that boarding-house lucrative if circumstances had not been against her.

Orion had other projects for recouping me, but as they always required capital I stayed out of them, and they did not materialize. Once he wanted to start a newspaper. It was a ghastly idea, and I squelched it with a promptness that was almost rude. Then he invented a wood-sawing machine and patched it together himself, and he really sawed wood with it. It was ingenious; it was capable; and it would have made a comfortable little fortune for him; but just at the wrong time Providence interfered again. Orion applied for a patent and found that the same machine had already been patented and had gone into business and was thriving.

Presently the State of New York offered a fifty-thousand-dollar prize for a practical method of navigating the Erie Canal with steam canal-boats. Orion worked at that thing for two or three years, invented and completed a method, and was once more ready to reach out and seize upon imminent wealth when somebody pointed out a defect: his steam canal-boat could not be used in the winter-time; and in the summer-time the commotion its wheels would make in the water would wash away the State of New York on both sides.

Innumerable were Orion's projects for acquiring the means to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pay off the debt to me. These projects extended straight through the succeeding thirty years, but in every case they failed. During all those thirty years his well-established honesty kept him in offices of trust where other people's money had to be taken care of, but where no salary was paid. He was treasurer of all the benevolent institutions; he took care of the money and other property of widows and orphans; he never lost a cent for anybody, and never made one for himself. Every time he changed his religion the church of his new faith was glad to get him; made him treasurer at once, and at once he stopped the graft and the leaks in that church. He exhibited a facility in changing his political complexion that was a marvel to the whole community. Once the following curious thing happened, and he wrote me all about it himself.

One morning he was a Republican, and upon invitation he agreed to make a campaign speech at the Republican mass-meeting that night. He prepared the speech. After luncheon he became a Democrat and agreed to write a score of exciting mottoes to be painted upon the transparencies which the Democrats would carry in their torchlight procession that night. He wrote these shouting Democratic mottoes during the afternoon, and they occupied so much of his time that it was night before he had a chance to change his politics again; so he actually made a rousing Republican campaign speech in the open air while his Democratic transparencies passed by in front of him, to the joy of every witness present.

He was a most strange creature—but in spite of his eccentricities he was beloved, all his life, in whatsoever community he lived. And he was also held in high esteem, for at bottom he was a sterling man.

About twenty-five years ago—along there somewhere—I suggested to Orion that he write an autobiography. I asked him to try to tell the straight truth in it; to refrain from exhibiting himself in creditable attitudes exclusively, and to honorably set down all the incidents of his life which he had found interesting to him, including those which were burned into his memory because he was ashamed of them. I said that this had never been done, and that if he could do it his autobiography would be a most valuable piece of literature. I said I was offering him a job which I could not duplicate in my own case, but I would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cherish the hope that he might succeed with it. I recognize now that I was trying to saddle upon him an impossibility. I have been dictating this autobiography of mine daily for three months; I have thought of fifteen hundred or two thousand incidents in my life which I am ashamed of, but I have not gotten one of them to consent to go on paper yet. I think that that stock will still be complete and unimpaired when I finish these memoirs, if I ever finish them. I believe that if I should put in all or any of those incidents I should be sure to strike them out when I came to revise this book.

Orion wrote his autobiography and sent it to me. But great was my disappointment; and my vexation, too. In it he was constantly making a hero of himself, exactly as I should have done and am doing now, and he was constantly forgetting to put in the episodes which placed him in an unheroic light. I knew several incidents of his life which were distinctly and painfully unheroic, but when I came across them in his autobiography they had changed color. They had turned themselves inside out, and were things to be intemperately proud of. In my dissatisfaction I destroyed a considerable part of that autobiography. But in what remains there are passages which are interesting, and I shall quote from them here and there and now and then, as I go along.

While we were living in Vienna in 1898 a cablegram came from Keokuk announcing Orion's death. He was seventy-two years old. He had gone down to the kitchen in the early hours of a bitter December morning; he had built the fire, and had then sat down at a table to write something; and there he died, with the pencil in his hand and resting against the paper in the middle of an unfinished word—an indication that his release from the captivity of a long and troubled and pathetic and unprofitable life was mercifully swift and painless.

(1898.)

[*Dictated in 1904.*] A quarter of a century ago I was visiting John Hay at Whitelaw Reid's house in New York, which Hay was occupying for a few months while Reid was absent on a holiday in Europe. Temporarily also, Hay was editing Reid's paper, the New York "Tribune." I remember two incidents of that Sunday visit particularly well. I had known John Hay a good many years, I had known him when he was an obscure young editorial writer on the "Tribune" in Horace Greeley's time,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earning three or four times the salary he got, considering the high character of the work which came from his pen. In those earlier days he was a picture to look at, for beauty of feature, perfection of form and grace of carriage and movement. He had a charm about him of a sort quite unusual to my Western ignorance and inexperience—a charm of manner, intonation, apparently native and unstudied elocution, and all that—the groundwork of it native, the ease of it, the polish of it, the winning naturalness of it, acquired in Europe where he had been Chargé d'Affaires some time at the Court of Vienna. He was joyous and cordial, a most pleasant comrade. One of the two incidents above referred to as marking that visit was this:

In trading remarks concerning our ages I confessed to forty-two and Hay to forty. Then he asked if I had begun to write my autobiography, and I said I hadn't. He said that I ought to begin at once, and that I had already lost two years. Then he said in substance this:

"At forty a man reaches the top of the hill of life and starts down on the sunset side. The ordinary man, the average man, not to particularize too closely and say the commonplace man, has at that age succeeded or failed; in either case he has lived all of his life that is likely to be worth recording; also in either case the life lived is worth setting down, and cannot fail to be interesting if he comes as near to telling the truth about himself as he can. And he *will* tell the truth in spite of himself, for his facts and his fictions will work loyally together for the protection of the reader; each fact and each fiction will be a dab of paint, each will fall in its right place, and together they will paint his portrait; not the portrait *he* thinks they are painting, but his real portrait, the inside of him, the soul of him, his character. Without intending to lie he will lie all the time; not bluntly, consciously, not dully unconsciously, but half-consciously—consciousness in twilight; a soft and gentle and merciful twilight which makes his general form comely, with his virtuous prominences and projections discernible and his ungracious ones in shadow. His truths will be recognizable as truths, his modifications of facts which would tell against him will go for nothing, the reader will see the fact through the film and know his man.

"There is a subtle devilish something or other about auto-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

biographical composition that defeats all the writer's attempts to paint his portrait *his* way."

Hay meant that he and I were ordinary average commonplace people, and I did not resent my share of the verdict, but nursed my wound in silence. His idea that we had finished our work in life, passed the summit and were westward bound down-hill, with me two years ahead of him and neither of us with anything further to do as benefactors to mankind, was all a mistake. I had written four books then, possibly five. I have been drowning the world in literary wisdom ever since, volume after volume; since that day's sun went down he has been the historian of Mr. Lincoln, and his book will never perish; he has been ambassador, brilliant orator, competent and admirable Secretary of State.

MARK TWAIN.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REAL AND THE IDEAL IN THE PAPACY.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.LITT.

THE Papacy is one of the greatest institutions that have ever existed in the world; it is much the greatest now existing, and it looks forward with calm assurance to a still greater future. Its dominion extends throughout the world over the only œcumenical church. All other churches are national or provincial in their organization. It reaches back in unbroken succession through more than eighteen centuries to St. Peter, appointed by the Saviour of the world to be the Primate of the Apostles. It commands the great central body of Christianity, which has ever remained the same organism since Apostolic times. All other Christian organizations, however separate they may be from the parent stock, have their share in the Papacy as a part of the Christian heritage and are regarded by the Papacy as subject to its jurisdiction. The authority of the Papacy is recognized as supreme in all ecclesiastical affairs, by the most compact and best-organized body of mankind, and as infallible in determination of doctrines of faith and morals when it speaks *ex cathedra*.

The history of the Papacy has been a history of storm and conflict. About it have raged for centuries the greatest battles in all history. The gates of Hell have been open in Rome, if anywhere in this world. At times it seemed as if Hell had emptied itself in Rome, and, to use the language of the Apocalypse, it were become "a habitation of devils and a hold of every unclean spirit" (Rev. xviii, 2). It is not strange that zealous Protestants, when they looked at the abominations that enveloped the Papacy in their times, saw in it the "woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy," and regarded it as "the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth" (Rev. xvii, 3-5). And yet these forces of evil have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always been driven back. When the conflict has subsided the Papacy has stood forth stronger than ever. If zealous Protestants, in their antipathy to the Papacy, picture it in all the imagery of the Biblical Anti-Christ, can we blame the defenders of the Papacy from applying to it the words of Jesus to St. Peter? Is there not historic truth in saying, "The gates of hell have not prevailed against it"? Are not the words of Jesus to St. Peter equally appropriate to his successors? "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you as wheat, but I made supplication for thee, that thy faith fail not: and do thou when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren" (Luke xxii, 31, 32).

The Papacy has a much firmer basis in a number of texts of the New Testament and in Christian history than most Protestants have been willing to recognize. There can be no doubt that Roman Catholic controversialists have warped the meaning of several passages of the New Testament in the interest of the most exaggerated claims for the Papacy. But, on the other hand, Protestant controversialists have minimized the importance of these texts and emptied them of their true meaning. Jesus, in His vision of His Kingdom, when St. Peter recognized Him as the Messiah, said (Matt. xvi, 17-19):

"Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jonah,
For flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee,
But my Father which is in heaven;
And I say unto thee: Thou art Peter,
And upon this rock will I build my church,
And the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.
I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of God.
And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,
And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

All attempts to explain the "rock" in any other way than as referring to Peter have ignominiously failed. As I have said elsewhere:

"St. Peter was thus made by the appointment of Jesus the rock on which the Church was built as a spiritual house, or temple; and at the same time the porter of the kingdom, whose privilege it is to open and shut its gates. The Church is here conceived as a building, a house, constituted of living stones, all built upon Peter, the first of these stones, or the primary rock foundation. It is also conceived as a city of God, into which men enter by the gates. These conceptions are familiar in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Old Testament, as well as in the New Testament. The significant thing here is the primacy of St. Peter. He is chief of the Twelve, who elsewhere in the New Testament are conceived as the twelve foundations of the temple and city of God. He is the chief porter, as elsewhere the Twelve have the authority of the keys, and the Church has it, as an assembly of Christians. Jesus gave them authority to admit into His kingdom, or to exclude therefrom."*

This saying of Jesus is confirmed by the history of the Apostolic age. Peter was certainly the chief of the Apostles, according to all the Gospels, during the earthly life of our Lord. The early chapters of "Acts" represent him as the acknowledged chief of the Apostolic community down to the Council at Jerusalem. If we had the continuation of the narrative of St. Peter's work in Antioch, western Asia and finally in Rome, in all probability the same undisputed leadership would appear. But the last half of the book of "Acts" follows the career of St. Paul, based on the narrative of one of his companions, probably Titus, and naturally St. Paul is the hero of that narrative. Furthermore, St. Paul's work is illustrated by his Epistles, which assume a most prominent position in the New Testament. It is very common among those who follow the Lutheran tradition, which makes the Epistle to the Galatians the test of the genuine theology of St. Paul and the key to Apostolic Christianity, to depreciate St. Peter in comparison with St. Paul. But, in fact, the Council of Jerusalem decided for St. Peter, and St. Paul himself abandoned his earlier unflinching adherence to theory in favor of the Christian expediency of St. Peter, in all of his subsequent life, as is evident from his own later Epistles and from the story of the companion of his travels. It has been established by modern historic criticism that the Church of the second century did not build on St. Paul, but rather on the Gospels and, presumably, on St. Peter. Harnack puts it in the form of an Irish bull when he says: "Only one Gentile Christian, Marcion, understood St. Paul, and he misunderstood him."

It is evident that Jesus, in speaking to St. Peter, had the whole history of His Kingdom in view. He sees conflict with the evil powers and victory over them. It is, therefore, vain to suppose that we must limit the commission to St. Peter. We could no more do that than we could limit the Apostolic commission to the Apostles. The commission of the primate, no less than the

* "Ethical Teaching of Jesus," p. 277.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commission of the Twelve, includes their successors in all time to the end of the world. The natural interpretation of the passage, therefore, apart from all prejudice, gives the Papacy a basal authority, as it has always maintained. Therefore we must admit that there must be a sense in which the successors of St. Peter are the rock of the Church, and have the authority of the keys in ecclesiastical government, discipline and determination of faith and morals. Inasmuch, however, as the commission is given to the Twelve and their successors also as to the power of the keys, it is necessary to take the several passages together, and conclude that the authority was given by our Lord to the Apostles in a body, and that it was given to St. Peter as the executive head of the body.

There are two other passages upon which the Papacy builds its authority. The chief of these is John xxi, where Peter is singled out from the seven who were with Jesus on the shore of the Sea of Galilee after his resurrection, and the command was given to Peter to "feed the sheep." Here Jesus appoints St. Peter to be the shepherd of the flock of Christ, which, in accordance with the usage of the time with reference to the kings of David's line, and with reference to Christ Himself as the Good Shepherd, implies government of the Church. It is all the more significant that this passage singles out and distinguishes Peter in the presence of the sons of Zebedee and others, the most prominent of the Twelve, and that the narrative is contained in the Gospel of John. Here again it cannot be supposed that this is a commission to St. Peter as an individual. He is given an office as the chief shepherd of the flock of Christ. If the flock continues, the chief shepherd must be the successor of St. Peter, to carry on his work as shepherd. The third passage is given in Luke xxii, 31, 32, mentioned above. None of these passages is in the Gospel of Mark, which represents the preaching of St. Peter as nearly as we can come to it; but in the other three Gospels, Matthew from Palestine or Syria, John from Asia Minor, and Luke from a disciple of St. Paul. They may well, therefore, represent the consensus of the Apostolic Church. These three words of Jesus to St. Peter were all uttered on the most solemn and critical occasions in the life of our Lord. They may all be regarded, therefore, as visions of our Lord, visions of His Kingdom and ideals of the Papacy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I cannot undertake to give even a sketch of the history of the Papacy. We shall have to admit that the Christian Church from the earliest times recognized the primacy of the Roman bishop; and that all the other great Sees at times recognized the supreme jurisdiction of Rome in matters of doctrine, government and discipline. It can easily be shown that the assumptions of the bishops of Rome were often resented, their intrusions into the rights of other patriarchates, provinces and dioceses were often resisted, their decisions were often refused; but, when the whole case has been carefully examined and all the evidences sifted, the statement of Irenæus stands firm:

"Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vainglory or by blindness or perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorized meetings; (we do this, I say) by indicating that tradition derived from the Apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church, founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church on account of its preeminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the Apostolic tradition has been preserved continuously by those (faithful men) who exist everywhere."

The historical development of the Papacy is one of the most stupendous series of events in history. Throughout the greater part of its history, until the Reformation, the Papacy represented the cause of the Christian people against emperor, kings and princelets. It was the saviour of Christian civilization from heathen barbarism. But towards the close of the Middle Ages, owing to its entanglement with political affairs and the exaggeration of its civil interests over against its ecclesiastical, the Papacy so stretched its prerogatives as to become a peril to the states of Europe, where absolutism had to be resisted at all costs in the interests of humanity and even of Christianity itself. After many ineffectual attempts to reform the Papacy by Christian Councils and movements of various kinds that had resulted in wide-spread and well-nigh universal dissatisfaction, Luther applied the match, and Europe was aflame in resistance to the unholy despotism of the Popes. Few, if any, thought of over-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

throwing the jurisdiction of the Papacy in ecclesiastical affairs, but they were determined to rid themselves of its despotism in all other affairs. But the inevitable result of the conflict was the repudiation by Protestantism of the jurisdiction of the Pope altogether. It was found that the ecclesiastical and the civil were so inextricably interwoven, at the time, that the whole fabric had to be cast off.

The Protestant Reformation was essentially a Protest, and so it might always have remained, a protest against Papal usurpation, with a willingness to recognize all valid, historical and Biblical rights of the Pope. But, by the irresistible force of circumstances, Protestantism was compelled to go further and organize itself in National Churches, entirely apart from any jurisdiction of the Pope. So far as there was a historical necessity for this course, it was valid. But when, later, Protestants went so far as to deny all the historic rights of the Papacy, Protestantism put itself in a false position which must ultimately be abandoned. In the mean time the Papacy has been obliged gradually to reform itself. The Council of Trent was a reforming Council, and there has been a slow, cautious, but steady advance in reform ever since. Catholics and Protestants all over the world are looking with hope and eagerness for great and wide-spread reforms, such as may remove the evils that brought about the division of the Church, and destroy the barriers which perpetuate the separation; and, in a spirit of love and concord, rally the entire Christian world about Christ our Lord and a successor of St. Peter who will be as near to Christ as St. Peter was, and as truly a representative of the Lord and Master as Shepherd of the flock of Christ, the executive head of a reunited Christianity. Is there in the Papacy as at present constituted any hope for the future? Can we see any prospects for such reforms as are necessary to reunion?

(1) The unity of the Church is in Christ, the head of the entire body of Christians. Such a Christianity embraces the world of the living and the dead, those in various stages of preparation, as well as those already Christian. Christianity in the world is organized in one Church, under the Apostolic ministry, culminating in the Universal Bishop, the successor of St. Peter. The three constituents necessary to complete unity are the Pope, the ministry and the people, a threefold cord which should not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be broken. The unity of the Church is not in the person of the Pope, but in his office, as the Universal Bishop, and as such the head of all the bishops, as these are of the ministers and people. In Christian history, the unity of the ministry has been expressed in Œcumenical Councils, that of the people in their lawful civil governments. Any failure to recognize and give due weight to each and all of these constituents of unity impairs the unity of the Church, but does not destroy it, so long as even one of the lines remains unbroken.

(2) The Pope, as the successor of St. Peter, is the executive head of the Church. But that which is essential to his office and the exercise of its functions should be distinguished from what is unessential and unnecessary. The primacy is independent of national or circumstantial relations. It is not necessary that the successor of St. Peter should be Italian or Roman. St. Peter was not a Roman, but a Jew of Palestine. The Popes have been, in fact, chiefly Roman or Italian, except for the periods of the supremacy of the German Empire, when there was a series of German Popes, and the supremacy of France and the residence of the Popes at Avignon, when there was a series of French Popes. This is a provincialization or nationalization of the Papacy, and is a serious hindrance to its universality. However important it may be, for historical reasons, that the successor of St. Peter should have his seat in Rome, it is not essential. St. Peter was primate before he went to Rome. His residence in Rome was brief, and there is no evidence that he would have remained permanently in Rome if he had lived. The residence of the Popes at Avignon for a long period makes this position necessary, otherwise the succession would be broken. It is not essential that the successor of St. Peter should be bishop of Rome. There is no sufficient evidence that he was ever bishop of Rome, or that Rome had a bishop in Apostolic times. The combination of a universal episcopate with a diocesan episcopate, however necessary in early times, has been productive of a multitude of evils. The Roman people have ever made claims in their choice of their own bishops which, while entirely appropriate to a diocesan bishop, could not be recognized as valid to a universal bishop, and were intolerable to other cities and nations. The interests of the city of Rome have ever been exaggerated at the expense of other cities and nations. This has tended to make the Papacy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

metropolitan and provincial, rather than universal. The efforts of the great Popes to do justice to their universal episcopate have kept them in constant strife with Rome and Italy until the present day. If in some way the office of the primate could be separated from diocesan, provincial and national episcopates and limited to œcumenical duties, a multitude of evils would be overcome.

(3) The primacy of the Pope does not depend upon any particular theory as to the extent of his jurisdiction. This has varied from age to age. The theory of the primacy of the Pope which prevailed in the ancient Catholic Church must be regarded as sufficient to maintain the unity of the Church in the Papacy, otherwise this unity did not then exist and cannot be derived by succession from the Apostles. The theory of the Papacy which now prevails in the Roman Catholic Church may be regarded as a development of the original definition of the primacy, but cannot be regarded as essential to its existence. Those who hold to the primacy of the Pope in the ancient Catholic sense cannot be regarded as violating the unity of the Church in the Papacy, because they refuse to regard this late development as valid. If the Papacy of to-day makes it impossible for them to take part actively in this unity, the Papacy itself is to blame.

The primacy of the Pope was recognized in the ancient Catholic Church even by Churches which were compelled to separate from Rome by unrighteous and intolerable tyranny of the Popes. The chief fault was with the Popes, who strained the lines of jurisdiction so far that they broke. If these faults of Rome should ever be reduced to a minimum, there is no sufficient reason why the separation should continue because of ancient faults. The slender thread of a recognized primacy, latent and inoperative, is still sufficient to maintain the essential unity of the Church.

The primacy of the Pope was recognized by the Protestant Reformers, who appealed from a Pope ill informed to a Pope well informed. They receded from the position only when expelled from the Roman Catholic Church, and when such a position became no longer practicable. Theoretically, Protestantism still remains Protestant, protesting against the excessive claims of the Papacy and willing to recognize its legitimate claims. When the jurisdiction of the Papacy is reduced to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

normal dimensions, there will remain no sufficient reason for the separation of the Protestant Churches, provided other obstacles have been removed.

(4) The primacy of the Popes does not depend upon any particular theory as to the subject-matter of their jurisdiction. That has varied from time to time, and only the Catholic essentials can be rightly demanded. The claims of the Papacy to jurisdiction in civil affairs and to dominion over civic governments have been justly refused by the nations at the expense of many wars, and are no longer of any practical importance. Even in the mild forms of mediation for peace, it has recently been rejected with unanimity by the nations at the Conference at The Hague. Such claims are against the express teaching of Jesus and His Apostles, and the practice of the ancient Catholic Church.

The claims of the Papacy to a Papal domain in the former States of the Church and the city of Rome have been rejected by the people of those States and the city of Rome itself. Whatever historic necessity there may have been for so extensive a civil dominion in the past, at present such an extended civil jurisdiction is impracticable and of no real importance. The Papacy must have a territory in which it may carry on the government of the Church throughout the world outside the jurisdiction of any particular civil government. But a very limited territory, such as the American District of Columbia, would be amply sufficient for that purpose.

The claim of the Papacy to determine questions of civil government for Roman Catholic citizens is resisted by modern peoples, and must be eventually withdrawn. Whether the attempt is made to influence the governments by representatives of the Papacy, as in Austria and Spain, or by the organization of Catholic parties for the maintenance of so-called Catholic principles, as in Germany, they intensify political strife by religious interests, they mix politics and religion, they provoke religious conflicts, and are demoralizing to the Roman Catholic Church itself.

The sad results of such Papal interference are now disturbing the great French nation. Whatever faults there may have been on the part of the French government, it was in fact defending itself against Papal interference, and it is not surprising that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the defence was at last transformed into an aggressive campaign, in the determination to get rid of the enemy once for all, and at all hazards. In such a conflict, it is vain for the Papacy to assert the divine constitution of the Church, for that divine constitution has nothing whatever to do with civil jurisdiction or rights of property.

The claims of the Papacy to determine questions of Science and Philosophy, of Sociology and Economics are resented and resisted by scholars and people interested in these matters. The syllabus of Pius IX was just such an intrusion of Papal jurisdiction, which has injured the influence of the Roman Catholic Church to a very great extent and has been productive of great mischief. The proposed issue of another syllabus by Pius X is a reactionary policy, which if carried out can only greatly imperil the influence of the Papacy upon the present generation. The continual inscribing on the Index of many of the best works of modern scholars, even those of devout Roman Catholics, is resented by scholars of all faiths. The recent decisions of the Papal Commission, under the lead of incompetent divines, against the sure results of modern criticism, present clear evidence of the intolerance of modern Roman scholasticism.

The claims of the Popes to determine social questions, such as marriage and divorce and public education, in their civil relations, have been resisted in all free countries, and have resulted in civil marriage and divorce, and in public schools without religious instruction. There can be no question of the right of the Pope to determine all ecclesiastical questions as regards marriage and divorce for Roman Catholic citizens, and to fortify ecclesiastical opinions by ecclesiastical penalties; or of the right of Roman Catholic citizens to organize parochial schools with religious instruction after their own mind; but any interference by the Pope directly or indirectly with such questions when under debate by modern governments cannot be less than a misuse of Papal jurisdiction.

(5) The jurisdiction of the Pope should be defined and limited by a constitution, as the executive office has been in all modern governments. The development of modern civil governments has been in the growth of constitutions, defining and limiting the power and jurisdiction of the executive, made necessary in order to the removal of the evils of absolutism and tyranny. The same

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

development is greatly needed in the Papacy for the same reasons. The Papacy is at present more absolute in its government than the Tsar of Russia or the Sultan of Turkey. It can no more be allowed to the Popes to define their own powers and the subject-matter of their jurisdiction than it can be allowed to modern monarchs. The history of the Papacy is a history of errors in this regard. The Popes have, in fact, claimed anything and everything they wished. Let them limit their jurisdiction to that which St. Peter exercised, and the world will have no quarrel with them. Constitutional definitions and restrictions are needed to restrain the Popes and their councillors, the cardinals, within their legitimate limits of jurisdiction; and also to defend the rights of the Papacy from the intrusion of civil governments. If the peril of former times was the excessive claims of the Popes, the peril at present is also the intrusion of the civil powers into ecclesiastical affairs. Such a constitution would protect the Pope in his rights as the executive head of the Church, and limit him only within his just sphere of jurisdiction.

The definition of the Vatican Council limits the sphere of the infallible authority of the Pope to faith and morals, and thereby declares fallible, though authoritative, his jurisdiction in all other matters. What is needed to make that definition more practical is to define not only the rights and liberties of the Church, but also the limits of that liberty, restraining the Church from interference with the States, and modern learning, and social and economical affairs, as well as restraining the States from interference with ecclesiastical affairs.

(6) The Primacy of the Pope is not apart from the Apostolic ministry but in union with it. The Orientals hold to the Œcumenical Councils and their supremacy, and maintain their unity through them. The subjugation of Oriental Christianity, with the exception of Russia, by Mohammedanism, has rendered it impracticable for the Orientals to engage in General Councils in modern times. The Roman Catholic Church, after the separation of the Orientals, continued to hold Œcumenical Councils down to the present time, twenty-two in all; but inasmuch as these Councils were limited to bishops, doctors and heads of Orders, in subjection to Rome, and excluded, especially since the Protestant Reformation, the representatives of the majority of Christian and Orthodox Churches, they are not regarded as œcumenical, except by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Roman Catholic Church itself. Protestants demanded an Œcumenical Council to reform the Church and settle the great problems and controversies of Christianity. The Council of Trent, which excluded them, and all others except those who submitted to the Pope, they could not recognize as truly œcumenical. Protestantism still demands an Œcumenical Council; and, so far as is practicable through international alliances and conventions and assemblies of various denominations, is striving to realize it. Those Christian Churches which recognize the unity of the Church in Œcumenical Councils adhere to those of the early Church, which were truly œcumenical, and long for such in the present time, to remove the distractions of Christianity, and hold to this line of unity so far as practicable—they are not so much to blame for the perpetuation of discord in the Church as those who make such Councils impossible.

The Roman Catholic Church has reduced the bishops to submission under the absolute dominion of the Pope. The overruling of the Councils of the episcopate of France on several recent occasions by the Pope, and their humble submission to his will, constitute one of the most melancholy situations in the history of Christianity. There is no other provision for a General Council of bishops than the desire, or need, of the Pope to convoke them. He alone determines the members of the Councils, which in any case are composed largely of bishops without jurisdiction, entirely dependent upon himself for support. If they are not sufficiently submissive, their decisions may be overruled and reversed at his will. The Vatican Council abdicated the rights of Councils in favor of the Pope. The Papacy thus deprived itself of the support of a Council at the very time when modern States, even Italy, found it necessary to establish and exalt the powers of representative bodies. A Council will not be called until needed to sustain the Pope. But it is evident that the Pope needs just such a Council and that he must call it erelong. It would not by any means injure the Primacy of the Pope if he were sustained by an episcopate meeting at regular intervals in a Council, as the Council of Constance prescribed. It would destroy his absolutism, which can only invoke passive obedience, but it would enhance his authority by giving it greatly needed support, and arouse the enthusiasm of the Church for greatly needed reforms. The Papacy should limit itself by a representa-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive Council of Bishops, giving to such a body the legislative functions of the Church, and restricting the Papal authority to executive functions and the right of initiative and veto in legislative matters as in all modern civil governments. The usual objections made to such representative Councils are evidently insincere. They simply indicate the reluctance of Rome to have any check upon its will. The bishops are required to report to the Pope every three or five years. It would be no more difficult to gather them at regular intervals of five years in Council. Other Christian Churches find no difficulty in assembling representatives from all parts of the world.

The Cardinalate is not a representative body, and can hardly be made one, because it is essentially engaged in the executive work of the Church, as the cabinets and officials of modern States. It is chiefly Italian, and largely Roman, and as such is influenced by Roman and Italian interests, often at the sacrifice of œcumenical relations. There is a strong feeling throughout the world, and even in Rome, that the Cardinalate should be a more representative body, less Italian and Roman. It is generally said that the present Pope will gradually bring this about. But he has done nothing thus far in this direction. The reluctance in Rome to appoint American cardinals, and the eager use of any and every excuse to avoid it, are striking evidences of the desire not to give the American Catholics their just share in the government of the Church and to keep them under the dominion of Rome. In view of the fact that the cardinals are diocesan bishops of the Roman province, presbyters of Roman Churches and deacons of the Roman diocese, they are too Roman to be œcumenical in office. Furthermore, the cardinals are really the cabinet of the Pope; and it is necessary that most of them should live in Rome in order to transact the business of the Church; therefore they cannot be truly representative of other nations.

In the Protestant world, the principle of representation is much further developed than in the Roman Catholic. The synods, diocesan, provincial, national and international, represent the ministry in most Protestant Churches. The representative principle has little influence at present in the Roman Catholic world. But there is no impediment to the full recognition of that principle and its practical efficient use, if the Papacy should so determine.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(7) The third line of unity is the consent of the Christian people. This consent has been recognized from the most ancient times, but its practical operation has been suppressed by the hierarchy in the Roman Church. When the Roman Empire became Christian, the Emperor, as the supreme ruler of the Christian people, had a potent influence in determining ecclesiastical and doctrinal affairs in the West, as well as in the East. The Emperor represented the Christian people, over against the clergy, and the people thereby had in fact an exaggerated influence in the Church. The right of the Emperor was inherited by the modern nations into which the Empire was divided, and passed over from king to princes, presidents, parliaments and congresses of the people. In all State Churches, the rights of the people centre in their sovereigns in all ecclesiastical affairs. In the Free Churches, the consent of the people is expressed by their representatives sitting with the ministry in various representative assemblies.

The Roman Church has always recognized this great original Catholic principle of unity, and therefore insisted upon the union of Church and State. Centuries of struggle with the Empire and the Kings and States of Europe were necessary, because of the conflict between civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, in which the emperors and kings were more often at fault than even the Popes, who resisted to the utmost every restriction upon a jurisdiction which they were ever eager to enlarge. The battle of the Reformation resulted in the overthrow of the Papacy in the north of Europe, and in the definition of the rights of the nations with regard to the affairs of the Church in southern Europe, by the establishment of Concordats.

A Concordat is something more than a commercial agreement. It is nonsense to say that a nation may not annul such an agreement without the consent of the Papacy. The Pope himself violated the Concordat with France by summoning two French bishops to Rome in spite of the prohibition of the French Government. The ecclesiastical and the civil interests were irreconcilable at the time, and the Pope had to act in accordance with the spiritual interests of the Church. But if the Pope may violate the Concordat in the interests of spiritual religion, the French Government may abrogate it in the interests of civil government. The separation of Church and State in Italy and France leaves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but two important Roman Catholic States, Austria and Spain, and these will doubtless soon follow the example of France. The fear of this result doubtless influences greatly the Papacy in its resistance to the present French Government. This is probably the last desperate struggle of the Papacy for political power. Its inevitable defeat will reduce its political relations to a minimum. It will be an immeasurable blessing to the world when civil politics disappear from the Papacy altogether.

For much the greater part of the Roman Catholic world the Popes have at present no means of determining the consent of the Christian people, except by their submission to the decisions of Rome made known through the episcopate. The Papacy has absorbed unto itself the authority of Councils and of the peoples also, and so has become the most absolute despotism on earth. The future of the Papacy in the modern world depends upon the reinvigorating of the latent principle of the consent of the people through their representatives in some form of ecclesiastical Council. There are, here and there, signs of the beginning of some such movement, and there is no obstacle to it except the consent of the Papacy.

(8) The eventual reunion of Christendom depends upon the reinvigoration and harmonious working out of the three lines of unity as a threefold cord of invincible strength. So far as the Papacy is concerned, it should be constitutional, and should give adequate representation to the clergy and the people, meeting in Councils at regular intervals. The three great divisions of Christendom have only partial unity through the use of one only of the lines of unity. The Roman Church makes the Papacy the most essential principle of unity to the neglect of the Œcumenical Council and the consent of the Christian people, which remain latent principles. The Greeks make the principle of unity the Œcumenical Councils and the consent of the people in the Emperor, the real head of the Church; the executive principle of the Papacy is latent. The State Churches of Protestantism emphasize the consent of the people in the authority of kings, princes and legislative bodies. The Free Churches employ the consent of the people in representative bodies. There are no valid reasons why the Papacy in the future may not reinvigorate the Council by making it truly representative of the ministry and the people of the Christian world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(9) In the most advanced modern States, the government distinguishes three great functions—the executive, legislative and judicial—each having its own appropriate organization. The executive function is exercised in monarchies by a king or emperor, in republics by a president. The legislative function is exercised by legislative bodies usually in two Houses, the one more directly representing the people, the other representing the nobility, or the more conservative interests. The judicial function is exercised by a bench of judges. In no Church has there been a sufficient discrimination in the development of these functions. All Churches alike are a long distance behind the civil governments in this matter. The Roman Catholic Church combines them all in the Papacy, just as in former ages they were combined in the Emperor. Protestant bodies combine all three functions, in Free Churches in national synods; in State Churches under various ecclesiastical authorities appointed by and subject to the State. The executive function is in the background even in Episcopal Churches. The judicial function is the one that is most neglected, and therefore it is always difficult to get a valid judicial decision of any important question, whether of doctrine, government, or discipline, in any of the Protestant Churches. There is no adequate training of the clergy in Canon Law, and they are therefore as a body altogether unfitted to sit as jurors or judges. The transformation of Church government into full accord with modern civil government would be a most important step towards the restoration of the full unity of the Church.

(10) There are no serious barriers in the way of such a transformation of the Papacy as may remove the chief objections of those Churches which do not at present recognize its supreme jurisdiction. The great principle of unity of Greek and Oriental Churches may become operative in Œcumenical Councils truly representing the entire Christian world. Such Councils may by their decisions so supplement, enlarge and improve the past decisions of the Roman Catholic Church and Popes that the objections to them may be removed and the entire world may accept the results. The infallible and irreformable determinations of Councils and Popes are few, and these may be so explained, limited or enlarged, and the essential so discriminated from the unessential, that even these discriminations may no longer be stumbling-blocks to the world. The great principle of Protestant

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christianity, the consent of the Christian people, may become operative in the introduction of representatives of the people into the presbyterial and synodical system of the Church. The bureaucracy of the Cardinalate and the Congregations at Rome may be reduced to the efficient system in use in all modern representative governments. The absolutism of the Pope may be destroyed by a constitution defining carefully the limitation and extent of his powers. The government of the Pope may be fortified and at the same time limited by a Council meeting every three or five years, representing the entire Christian world. The legislative function of the Papacy may be eliminated from the executive, as in the best modern States. The judicial function of the Papacy may be separated by the organism of a supreme court of Christendom. There is nothing in any infallible decision of Councils and Popes that in any way prevents some such transformation of the Papacy as is here conceived of. This ideal may be in its details an illusion—doubtless most will think it such—but whether the outlines of this ideal and its details be mistaken in whole or in part, it is certain, as Jesus Christ our Saviour reigns over His Church and the world, that some day, in some way, the Papacy will be reformed so as to correspond with His ideal, and will be so transformed as to make it the executive head of a universal Church.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OBJECTIONS TO A POSTAL SAVINGS-BANK.

BY GEORGE E. ROBERTS, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

THE sentiment in favor of a Postal Savings system is prompted by a most commendable desire to furnish absolute security for the small depositor, who, by resolution and self-denial, has laid up something against old age or a rainy day. The interest of the State and community in such accumulations is perfectly apparent, and the importance of having in every locality convenient and absolutely safe depositaries for them is too evident to require lengthy argument. There is scarcely any experience through which a community can pass that is more distressing and disheartening than the failure of a bank which involves wiping out the painfully won savings upon which hundreds of men and women are relying for the needs of old age. There is scarcely another service which modern society can render to the masses that is more helpful and stimulating than this of encouraging and safeguarding small savings.

It does not, however, follow that, in the United States, the Federal Government is the agency best qualified to assume this task. The idea of a savings-bank in the Post-office Department comes to us from Europe, and it has not been closely scrutinized as to its adaptability to conditions here. It has three features which commend it—to wit: cheapness of administration, the convenience to the public of an office in each post-office and the security of the Government obligation. For European countries there is another consideration, viz: it furnishes a large market for Government loans. There are reasons why the Postal Savings-bank is not as suitable an institution for the United States as for Great Britain, or for the other countries where it has worked successfully. These reasons have their basis mainly in the territorial extent of this country and the differences that exist in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the wealth and industrial development of its various sections. The injury that would result to this country from having a considerable portion of its capital drained from the outlying districts to a centre, for investment in a limited line of securities, is deserving of very serious consideration. Great Britain is a small country compared with the United States, and every part of it, besides being reasonably well supplied with local capital, is not far distant from the financial metropolis; but the disadvantage of the withdrawal of savings deposits from local use is observed even there. The London "Bankers' Magazine" for February, 1899, discussing the comparative services in a community of a branch office of the postal bank and a branch office of one of the great commercial banks, says:

"The branches of the Post-Office Savings-Bank convey all the savings of the district which they receive straight up to the central office in London. This money is employed there in purchases of the public funds of the country; it is thus removed from the district in which it originates, and incidentally assists in raising the price of the funds to so high a point that the Postmaster-General is unable to invest the amount collected on such terms as to obtain back the interest which he covenants to allow his depositors, and to obtain also a sufficient margin to meet the working expenses.

"The deposits in the Post-Office Savings-Banks thus eventually cause an expense to the country. There was a deficiency in the Savings-Bank Funds last year which had to be made up out of the public taxation. The deposits in the branch of a bank in a small town or village are, on the other hand, a source of gain to the country; they are of great service in developing the trade of the place in which the bank exists, and in assisting the inhabitants in their business. The habit of keeping an account with a bank is now general even among very small traders, and in very remote districts. This habit could scarcely exist were it not for the existence of branch banking-offices. Any one engaged in buisness can scarcely keep his account at a place very distant from the locality in which his business is carried on. There are so many occasions on which any one carrying on a really active business has to refer to his banker, and when a personal interview is convenient if not essential, that proximity is most desirable. Other results, also affecting the economic development of the country, follow. The advantages of the use of 'credit,' that most powerful factor in the growth of trade and industry, are extended to dwellers in the most remote districts. With proper precautions and care in making advances, great advantages to the country districts result. Minor, but not unimportant, advantages follow; the use of specie and of notes is economized, while the trade of the country is increasingly carried on by means of checks. None of these advantages take place in the case of the opening of a new branch of the Post-Office

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Savings-Bank. They are mentioned here as they sometimes escape the attention of our public men, even of those acquainted with other descriptions of business. They think merely of the savings-banks as showing the power of the country to put by and save, and they do not think of the other side of the picture."

The Postal Savings deposits, at all offices throughout the British system, are sent up to the central office in London and invested in British consols; and complaint is above made that the constant purchases for the Postal Bank had, in 1899, forced up the price of the consols and made the return on the investment so low that the Bank was running behind. Since then the British Government has been forced to issue many millions of new obligations, and the price of consols has fallen so that the situation of the Bank, as respects income on recent purchases, has improved. Nevertheless, the statement is instructive as showing the natural effect of gathering funds from all over a country for investment in a restricted class of securities.

Below is an extract from the London "Statist" of December 22, 1906, in which are described the ill effects upon the industries of Ireland resulting from the constant drain of Postal Savings deposits to London. If these deposits had been made in local savings-banks, and invested locally, they would have contributed to the development of Ireland's resources and the employment of the Irish people, instead of being tied up in consols. The "Statist" says:

"Ireland is a very poor country. Her resources are quite undeveloped. Practically, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that she has not yet entered upon an economic life. . . . Naturally, therefore, she requires abundant capital and abundant labor. . . . In June of the present year the Irish deposits in the Savings Banks were, in round numbers, 13 millions sterling, and this (for Ireland) very large sum is employed not in developing any Irish industry, but in bolstering up the credit of the United Kingdom. . . . Nobody will dispute that the Irishman of enterprise is seriously handicapped by the fact that so much Irish money is drawn away from Irish to Imperial purposes. Just as Ireland has been laying out large sums annually for sixty-five years in rearing young men and women to export them, without getting any return, to the United States and the Colonies, to create there vast wealth, so in finance Ireland is pinching and saving about 13 millions of money to export it to London for the purpose of bolstering up an amateurish system of finance, which has brought the national credit to the pitch at which we see it."

What would be the result of opening a savings-bank in connection with every post-office in the United States, and of re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitting all the deposits to Washington for investment in a limited list of securities? In the first place, what would be the effect upon the communities from which these moneys were withdrawn? The last report of the Comptroller of the Currency shows the amount of deposits in savings-banks at that time to have been over $3,000,000,000. Of course there is no probability that all of this money would be transferred to the Postal Savings-banks; but, on the other hand, there are many deposits in national and State banks, and with trust companies and other institutions, which might be attracted to the Government's strong-box. The extent of the displacement would, doubtless, depend somewhat upon the rate of interest paid, and there would be some danger of that being more or less involved in politics, reluctance to reduce the rate being shown in England where the system has an annual deficit. If we believe that the system would meet a general need, we must assume that it would draw a large sum in the aggregate. This money is now invested locally. It is an important part of the capital upon which each community is doing business. It is loaned largely upon real estate mortgages, partly upon personal security, it is partly invested in local bonds or real estate. It is being used in the locality where it is owned and contributing to the development of that locality, the support of its industries and the employment of its people. If this capital is removed to Washington for investment, what will be the effect upon the communities from which it is taken?

The authorities at Washington cannot redistribute this capital by investments to the same sections from which it came. The discretion allowed any board of managers in the investment of such funds would undoubtedly be quite restricted. Government bonds, State bonds and municipal bonds would probably constitute the list. Perhaps railway bonds would have to be included; but the making up of a list of eligible railway bonds would be a delicate task. In brief, the investments of the Postal Savings-bank would be in securities of a high class, which yield a low return, and which now find a market only in the wealthier sections of the country, among people who are not so much interested in the interest-rate as in the security of the principal. It is not likely that any savings-bank in a State like Iowa has to-day a dollar of investments that would be accepted by a Postal Savings-bank. There are bond issues in Iowa that the latter in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitution might accept, but they are of such a high class, the competition for them from outside the State is so keen and the returns from them so low that banks within the State can do better in investments of a more local character. Capital owned in Iowa is not at present invested in low interest-bearing securities. It is likely, therefore, that all the deposits diverted from Iowa banks to the Postal Savings-bank would be so much capital lost to that State while on deposit. It would be brought down to the already congested money markets of the East, to multiply the demand for the limited supply of choice securities that have a national and international market. The result must be an economic loss to the country; for capital is transferred from where it is most needed to where it is least needed. To the extent in which this transfer occurred—that is, to the extent in which the system became popular and effective—its influence would be to reduce the earnings of these savings, widen the difference in interest-rates between different sections of the country, retard the distribution of industries and population and check the development of the country.

The question is, Is it necessary to bring about these undesirable effects in order to accomplish the end sought, viz: the security of the small depositor? Let it be agreed that he should have complete protection. Can it not be provided without the forced removal of this capital from the locality to which it belongs, where perhaps it is affording employment to its owners, and where it can be utilized most advantageously to all concerned?

There are industries and lines of enterprise which can be advantageously centralized, but the investment of great sums of popular deposits cannot. These investments should follow natural channels, with only such restrictions as are necessary to obtain safety. There should be no enforced removal of funds that can be avoided. With capable managers who are familiar with the values of real estate in their own neighborhoods and with all local conditions, local institutions can invest these deposits safely, and much more serviceably to the whole country than any central board at Washington can do it. Granted that reform in banking laws and methods are needed, let financiers and social reformers direct their aims to securing a reform that is consistent with the most effective use of our capital, and that will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promote rather than retard the harmonious development of all sections of the country.

It will be a very weak and unscientific treatment of the problem in hand to consider only the sentimental phase and dispose of the whole matter by unloading it on the Federal Government, the one political organization of all least qualified to deal with it. This is one of our problems, and not the only one, which our people should deal with at home, instead of petitioning for relief from afar.

Several States have already shown how the subject may be dealt with successfully. New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut have mutual savings-banks, conducted wholly for the benefit of depositors, and so well safeguarded that no serious losses have occurred for many years. All of the earnings, after expenses are paid and a surplus fund has been accumulated, are distributed in dividends to the depositors. Most of these banks are now earning four per cent. for depositors. On July 1, 1906, there were 134 savings-banks in the State of New York, holding $1,335,093,053.62. The only losses that have been suffered by savings-bank depositors in that State in the twenty-eight years since January, 1879, have been due to the scaling of deposits in five banks, by order of the Courts, to make good losses that had been sustained in two cases by the dishonesty of employees, in two cases by the failure of national banks in which funds were on deposit and in one case by bad loans. The cases in which losses occurred were as follows:

1. Ulster County Savings-Institution. Defalcation discovered in 1891. Deposits were scaled 15 per cent. The bank is still in business and prosperous; on July 1, 1906, it held deposits aggregating $3,284,554.92, had a surplus of $138,672.39, and it paid dividends to depositors in 1906 at the rate of 3½ per cent.

2. National Savings-Bank, Buffalo. Defalcation in 1892. Deposits were scaled 22 per cent. and bank reorganized as Empire State Savings Bank. Went out of business in 1902, and the Superintendent of Banks reports that there may be a further loss of two or three per cent.

3. Southern Tier Savings-Bank, a small institution (afterwards Elmira Savings-Bank). Suffered a loss in 1893 by the closing of a national bank in which it had a deposit of $42,704.67. Deposits were scaled 20 per cent. The business after that date was kept separate from the old, and the bank is now prosperous, paying dividends in 1906 at the rate of 3½ per cent. Some further distribution will be made on the old loss.

4. Chenango Valley Savings-Bank. Found to be insolvent in 1895.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deposits were scaled about 15 per cent. The bank continues in business and paid dividends in 1906 of 3 per cent.

5. Carthage Savings-Bank. Dragged down in 1898 by failure of a national bank with which it had a deposit. Has paid 95 per cent. of its deposits.

It will be seen that the Carthage case, in which there was a loss of five per cent., is the only one which occurred within the last ten years. The entire showing for the system under the present law is an encouraging one.

The Massachusetts and Connecticut systems are similar to that of New York. The savings-banks in these three States, to use the language of Mr. Jay, of Massachusetts, describing those of his own State, "have no paid-up capital; they are not banks at all, but mutual investment associations, the depositors paying their deposits to the trustees, who invest the money and declare in dividends to the depositors substantially all that they are able to earn on the money. The balance goes to form a surplus or guaranty fund."

No system can be pronounced perfect so long as losses occur; but, when the advantages of higher returns to depositors and employment of the moneys at home are considered, there is no reason why the people of either of these States should want to exchange their system for a Postal Savings-bank. They will do better by holding to what they have and remedying existing defects. Not only will it be better for depositors and the communities financially, but it is not to be forgotten that self-help is always to be preferred to outside aid or control. What a State or local community can do for itself it should not want the United States Government to meddle with. Those functions of organized society which may be performed by local associations are part of the social life of the people, and they ought to participate in them. The experience thus acquired has an educational value, helping to qualify the body of the people for other and larger undertakings of a cooperative character.

GEORGE E. ROBERTS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GEORGES CLÉMENCEAU.

BY L. ANDRIEUX.

I MET Georges Clémenceau for the first time in 1860 at the Latin quarter in a newspaper office. Among the various contributors to the paper "*Le Travail,*" the editor of which was Germain Casse, later on deputy of La Guadeloupe. I had at once noticed the young student: his convex and prominent forehead, the keen and penetrating gaze of his dark eyes under bushy and boldly pencilled eyebrows, his heavy mustache falling upon the ironical lips produced the impression of will, energy and intelligence.

Brought together by a common feeling of revolt against all oppressing powers, we were not long in forming a connection of good-fellowship; being both filled with the enthusiasm of the twentieth year, we poured it forth in vehement essays, published in the same little weekly papers of the *Rive gauche* during all these years of awakening and effervescence, when the youth of the various Faculties began to assult the *Empire.*

Clémenceau was always a hard worker; his medical studies and the philosophical researches which he added to them were strong enough an attraction to keep him from the political *cafés* where the marble tables were used as pulpits by the future orators of the republican party; he was more likely to be met either in the silent libraries or in the hospitals.

Our different courses soon parted us; I had left Paris when he maintained his thesis on "The generation of anatomical elements," in which he proclaimed his faith that through science might be discovered "the enigma of things," and opposed it to the scepticism of the positivist school.

During the long time he spent in the United States, where his experience of free institutions strengthened his hatred to per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal power, I heard but little of Clémenceau except by the remarkable essays which he sent to the paper "*Le Temps*" on the economic and literary development of the great nation to the service of which it seemed then that he would give up his life.

He was, however, in Paris when the Empire was overthrown; being Mayor of Montmartre, and having been elected deputy of the Seine to the National Assembly, he was liable to the heaviest responsibilities during the insurrection of the 18th of March. Had it not been tried, through the treachery and hatred of parties, to involve him in the murder of Generals Clément Thomas and Lecomte? For whoever happens to know him, his energetic denials were unnecessary. Let it be enough to recall that Clémenceau, in the town hall of the eighteenth district, heard of this tragedy when it was already over. A man must have lived in a great city in insurrection time to realize how speedily and fatally happen the events whirled along by the torrent of excitable crowds. At about the same time, at Lyons, where I was *Procureur de la République,* I heard but too late, by the tardy warning of gun-reports, of the murder of Major Arnaud, and it never came to the thought of any of my enemies that I might have prevented it.

The members that made up the National Assembly and their evident desire to restore monarchy might have inclined Clémenceau to stand against the government of M. Thiers. But was not a freely elected Assembly the only legitimate power? Had not universal suffrage committed to it the trust of national sovereignty? Was not insurrection, with the enemy at hand, doomed beforehand to a repression in which the Republic might be destroyed? Hesitating between various feelings, Clémenceau remained on the side of duty; but he was one of the most active members of the "League for Paris Rights"; he took an important part in all the attempts at conciliation which, disowned on both sides with equal obstinacy, were looked upon at Versailles as the acts of an accomplice, and in Paris as treachery.

After four years spent in the Town Council of which he was elected President, Clémenceau was, in 1876, sitting in the Chamber of Deputies, where I met him. I had been sent there myself by the department of the Rhône at the same time that he was nominated by the constituents of the eighteenth district of Paris.

He was sitting at the extreme Left, near Lockroy and Georges

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Périn. Bent on having their party respected, perfectly trained in pistol-shooting and fencing, ever ready to call out the parliamentary quarrels on another ground, these three deputies never heard any challenge from the Right without at once taking it up. Gambetta had nicknamed them "the three musketeers."

When, after a tribune incident, I fought with Paul de Cassagnac my first Parliamentary duel, Clémenceau himself took me to the famous armorer Gastine Rennette, and gave me my first lesson in firing at the word of command.

The legislatures followed one another, and each of them brought new forces to the republican party. Decimated as it was by invalidations, losing more and more the confidence of the country, the Right was no more a danger to be feared by the new institutions. But at the same time as the Republic was getting strengthened, a new peril was arising from the very ranks of the republicans.

The same men who had signed the advanced programmes of the party, those who, by their words, had led on democracy to the hope of a better life under a system of justice and equality, seemed to forget their engagements and stop, satisfied in the enjoyment of the power they had conquered. The revolutionists of yesterday were preaching for patience; it was necessary, they said, to go slowly in order to get on safely; advisable to solve the questions each in turn; to take into account prejudices and inveterate habits, so as not to provoke a reaction. As there is no sudden bound in the scale of beings, so there must not be any in the evolution of political institutions. And upon these principles had been formed a fresh party, called after a nasty name —the *opportunisme*. Its members discussed willingly the opportunity of having "a policy grounded on business," and this saying attributed to the last minister of King Louis Philippe: "By all means, get rich!" seemed called to a new occasion.

Clémenceau took his stand against the opportunism; he wished for a republican Republic, with all its consequences, and to the policy of concession opposed intransigent principles.

Thence came his ceaseless struggles against the ministers who drew their inspiration from the new doctrine, and the downfall of cabinets in turn; thence, wounded interests and vanities, and hatred whose reprisals Clémenceau was to suffer later on.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The first question upon which the moderates and the extreme Left were obviously divided, was that of the amnesty. It took up several sittings in the month of May, 1876.

Standing up against the conclusions of the parliamentary commission, Clémenceau, for his maiden speech, came up to plead the cause of forgetting and forgiving in such refined and precise language, with such elevation of thought and dialectic power that he has since been among the foremost orators of his party.

He spoke of the *Commune* as a patriot who could hardly conceal from himself how criminal was the attempt against the legitimate representatives of the nation; he chimed in with the interruption of his friend Georges Périn, who had exclaimed: "Had we approved of the Commune, we would have fought in its ranks." But while disowning insurrection, he stated eloquently what circumstances might lessen the responsibility of the insurgents: the agonies of a siege, the anger of a town whose courage had been every day exasperated without any opportunity of being given vent to, the shame of capitulation, the meeting of an Assembly threatening for the Republic and for the rights of Paris; the metropolis deserted by a government given up to violent designs; the pitiless reprisals which were to constrain the incensed and despairing combatants to a merciless struggle.

I can still see Clémenceau standing in the tribune while he enlarged upon his argument in curt, simple sentences, unpretending and unaffected, without any bombastic and oratorical show, but accurate, neat and to the point. The want of experience in tribune speaking did perhaps bring too frequent pauses, and the voice happened to drop more than was necessary at the end of the sentences; but when interruptions would rouse the orator his ever-on-the-alert wit flashed out in quick, humorous and lashing replies. His thought, without losing any of its strength or perspicacity, gained in originality what it lost in rhetorical fustian. The time of forgiveness was to come only three years later; the motion on amnesty was rejected by 392 votes to 50.

However, the far-away expeditions in which Jules Ferry, against the will of the nation, involved the French policy, were for Clémenceau an opportunity for new oratorical successes. The partisans of these expeditions to-day pride themselves on their having succeeded, without too many complications, in extending our colonial possessions. In order to judge fairly of the oppo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sition they met with, we must remember what was the situation of France after her late disasters, of what ceaseless danger she was threatened on her Eastern frontier and what mighty reasons she had, in her loneliness, to lose none of her forces for fanciful advantages. Has it been forgotten that the establishment of our protectorate over Tunis was the direct cause of that Triple Alliance whose weight has been so long and so heavy a burden on our foreign policy?

Clémenceau, moreover, brought forward in his argument lofty considerations of human solidarity, and his appeal could not be unheard of the nation which, proud of having, by its philosophers and revolutions, diffused throughout the world its ideas of right and justice, had just been yielding to main strength.

The events of the year 1888, by obliging the republicans to concentrate their efforts on the common defence, put an end to the opposition spirit of Clémenceau. An ambitious general, thinking less of his own honor or military duty than of the gratifications following on power, had listened with complacency to the flatteries and promises of the reactionary parties; availing himself, on the one hand, of the discomposition and despondency of an assembly divided into three nearly equal parts, where none but coalition majorities were possible, and on the other hand of the discontent of a country lured by vain promises and holding liberty accountable for its disappointments, General Boulanger, on a negative programme, had grouped and was leading to the onset from the parliamentary system the most numerous party, the party of malcontents.

Clémenceau, who had at first thought that he might use the popularity of Boulanger as a fighting instrument against opportunism, promptly separated from him, and when the alliances of the general had left no more doubts as to his designs, boldly denounced his suspicious programme.

Besides, for the late few months, the radical party had come into office, and if the political reforms were still only in contemplation, the reason of it was, before thinking of gathering the fruits, to prevent the uprooting of the tree.

The 12th of July sitting in the Chamber of Deputies was especially stormy. General Boulanger, deputy of the North department, had made a motion for the Chamber to be dissolved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and had enlarged upon it in words offensive to his colleagues. The Prime Minister, Charles Floquet, replied by a cutting speech which met with much applause on the Left, and Boulanger retorted by giving the lie to him, in the most insulting form. Floquet at once intrusted two of his friends, Georges Clémenceau and Georges Périn, with the charge of demanding from the General reparation by a duel. Boulanger put them in communication with MM. Laisant and Le Hérissé, and the encounter took place on the following morning; the opponents were to fight with swords.

The want of experience of both opponents made things equal. Scarcely had Clémenceau, who managed the fight, joined the points of the swords and pronounced the traditional words: "*Partez, Messieurs!*" than General Boulanger, hand low and uplifted point, charged right down upon his opponent, in double step, as at the point of the bayonet. Floquet stepped backwards on and on, at the same speed, arm and sword extended, till he got to the wall. Boulanger, still rushing on, fell, his throat upon the sword of his opponent, who was himself slightly wounded.

The wound of the General seemed most serious, and during a few hours his friends had to fear that it might imperil the destiny of boulangism.

That very same day had taken place on the *Place du Carrousel* the inauguration of a monument in memory of Gambetta. Lost in the crowd, I was present at the ceremony and could see, on the first rank of the official tribune, Charles Floquet who, surrounded by many friends, was receiving the congratulations of the senators and deputies. I could not hear his words, but I saw his gestures, now straight and now rounded, which meant, as far as I was able to understand his mimicking: "*Coutre de quarte! . . . Coutre de tierce! . . . Septime enveloppée . . . Coup droit!*"

Clémenceau was listening with a discreetly sceptical look; as to Floquet, he was convinced that his fencing had just jugulated Cæsarism.

What followed is well known: how Boulanger fled away to Belgium, then to England, his trial brought before the *Haute-Cour*, and the final downfall of an unprincipled coalition which ended in a romantic adventure.

This victory was mostly due to Clémenceau. Those who had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been defeated had no doubt about it, and when the electoral struggle of August 20th, 1893, came, their rancor, added to the ill-will of the opportunists, caused him to fail in the department of Var, which he was then representing in the Chamber.

Excluded from Parliament, Clémenceau was in no way dispirited. If he could not speak, he could write. He became the chief contributor of the paper "*La Justice,*" of which he had only been hitherto the inspirer and the political leader. But his own paper was not enough for his active mind. He wrote, besides, remarkable articles for the "*Dépêche de Toulouse,*" the "*Journal,*" the "*Figaro*" and the "*Echo de Paris,*" published two books on sociology, "*Le grand Pan*" and the "*La Mêlée sociale,*" a novel "*Les plus forts,*" and had a philosophical play, "*Le Voile du bonheur,* acted at the Renaisance theatre.

The Dreyfus affair arises. The Scheurer-Kestner papers, the acquitment of Esterhazy, the letter of Zola, the trial of Rennes, stir up and divide public opinion. Clémenceau is the editor of "*L'Aurore,*" the chief organ in the revision campaign.

In his press dissertations, the editor of "*La Justice,*" and "*L'Aurore*" was in the habit of taking up the most trifling fact among the miscellaneous news and to rise up from it to general ideas which he took delight in expounding. The Dreyfus *affaire* appeared to him a favorable opportunity for giving vent to his favorite arguments, and I hope I am not wandering from the path of truth when I say that the revision of the Dreyfus trial was for the brilliant polemist more a pretext than an object. Is not the atmosphere of indifference and forgetfulness which every day grows thicker around the rehabilitated convict a proof that the public, too, at least in France, was taking less interest in Dreyfus himself than in the political quarrels of his opponents and partisans?

Outside the Parliament, Clémenceau went on exercising over his party an influence which often proved preponderating. "I am voting for Loubet," he wrote on the day following the death of Felix Faure, and this mere title of a newspaper article was as a watchword for the majority of the Congress. Elected president of the Republic, M. Loubet acted according to the law of his origin; but the very moderation of his ideas, by contributing to make radicalism accepted more easily, explained Clémenceau's perspicacity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1902, after ten years of exclusion, the senatorial constituents gave Clémenceau back to the Parliament. There, he supports Waldeck-Rousseau, M. Combes, M. Rouvier who, perhaps reluctantly, perseveres in the policy of his predecessor. But Clémenceau is, so to speak, in the margin of the majority; both by his speeches and votes, he asserts his independence and does not spare his criticisms of all measures he disapproves of. He seems to be divided between freedom which he means to remain faithful to, and the ministerial majority to which he is unable to give the slip while the separation of Church and State is being discussed.

"I do not bring my help to *M. le President du Conseil,*" did he say in his speech in the Senate on October 30th, 1902, for he does not need it; I will presently by my vote take place in the ranks of this republican majority which, to the counter-revolution of the Roman Church whose formula is the syllabus, opposes the spirit of the French revolution such as it is expressed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man." And having thus proclaimed his faithfulness to his party, he goes on to make a profession of liberalism which must be noted as one of the most prominent features in his political career.

"I think," he said, "that the duty of the republican party is to look with indifference upon the violent passions which are sometimes raging against it, and that we must honestly and peacefully try and know whatever amount of truth and justice there may be, even in the most insulting claims of our opponents. This is, at least, my own turn of mind. I say that to-day it is for me a cause of great anxiety to know what may be rightful in the complaints of our opponents, and I think that the superior interest of the Republic demands that justice be done. I think that the History of the Revolution shows that whenever violence has been used by the liberals it has always ended by turning round upon liberty."

And further on: "Now the power is yours, now that you hold in your hands the governmental authority, will you indeed become afraid of liberty? It shall not be. And were it to be, I would not stand with you. . . . Gentlemen, as a final argument, *M. le President du Conseil* has said: 'We have the power and we have the right.' He has certainly never heard that he was to use power otherwise than for the service of right. As to me, I will speak plainly, and without reserve: were there to be any conflict

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between Republic and liberty, the Republic would certainly be wrong and I would decide in favor of reason."

Close upon the late legislative elections, when the Rouvier Cabinet had to leave, M. Armand Fallières had already succeeded M. Loubet in the first magistracy of the Republic.

No likeness, either moral or physical, is to be found between M. Fallières and M. Clémenceau. I could try, in a more lengthy way, to bring out the contrast between the homely virtues, the quiet disposition, the refined and ingenious mind, though rather slow in its flight, of the President of the Republic and the fiery, independent, energtic and impulsive nature of the Var senator. However, as if the same attraction laws applied equally to human and inanimate bodies, these two men, so different from one another, feel a deep sympathy for each other.

The President was wise enough to resist his personal feelings, and he asked M. Sarrien to constitute a Cabinet. Commended to the choice of the President by his long experience and by the confidence the majority had in him, M. Sarrien secured the cooperation of M. Clémenceau, who assumed the Home Department.

It must be understood that official candidateships are far from being in the republican habits; yet the Home Secretaries are nevertheless held responsible for their party's failures; that is the reason why the victory of the republican candidates in the elections of last May strengthened the public trust in Clémenceau.

During the parliamentary vacation, while his colleagues were either keeping silent or uttering words without any echo or authority, the oratorical successes of the Home Secretary, both in the Var and in Vendée, increased his importance in the opinion of his party and were carrying him on, in the most natural way, to the Presidency of the Cabinet, when, on account of his health, or perhaps because he had the feeling of a new situation coming on, M. Sarrien decided upon retiring from office.

The new Cabinet was formed with the quick decision usual to Clémenceau. Criticised by some, praised by others, the choices he made were to none a surprise. I fancy that he was induced to appoint M. Viviani to the Labor Department through the wish of disarming the collectivists before fighting with them and of beginning the necessary struggle against them without endan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gering too much the equilibrium of his Cabinet in the Parliament. As to the preferment of General Picquart to the War Department, I think I can explain it by the fact that this officer, in his efforts to drive back the surging flood of antimilitarism, and to obtain from the Chambers sacrifices necessary to the strength of our army, would be greeted by the majority with special favor. Satisfaction in the matter of individuals is much to be appreciated by assemblies; it moves them to action. There is nothing like a radical minister for making a moderate policy.

The new ministry is just now struggling hard with the difficulties arising from the application of the law on the separation of Church and State. They have no doubt been handled with less professional authority and not so thorough a knowledge of ecclesiastical hierarchy than might have been expected from M. Combes, but with a more heartfelt wish not to infringe in any way upon the rights of conscience and the free exercise of worship. The resistance shown by the Vatican with regard to the creation of *associations cultuelles* for the devolution of Church property has been for the promoters of the law a first disappointment which has been most painfully shared by prominent men among the Catholics. At the risk of losing the confidence of the majority and with conciliating intentions that it would be unfair to disregard, the ministry has proposed for the exercise of worship the common law used for public meetings, with the only obligation of making an annual declaration, the interest of which would not be easily perceived if its object was not to give an apparent satisfaction to the demands of the law. Considering himself as the sole judge of what his conscience, his faith, the constitution of the Church and the interests in his keeping dictate, the Pope has rejected the formalities of the declaration as he had already forbidden the creation of *associations cultuelles* and as he has just been repelling a new attempt to transactional legislation. He goes on his way, his eyes lifted up to heaven, confident in the words of Christ, fearless of earthly abysses. Rome having spoken, the French Catholics have acquiesced with a submission and a disinterestedness to which greatness cannot be denied. And there they are, standing between those two irreductible things, dogma and law.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The religious questions are once more paralyzing the republican government in its onward course towards social reforms. Clémenceau claims the qualification of socialist, granted to him by Viviani but refused by Jaurès. It is true that he adds to it the qualification of *radical,* which might be a diminutive. All that is a question of words and definitions.

If the Catholic Church ever happens to fail us, another one is ready to supply its place, that of *Collectivisme unifié.* As it possesses its pontiffs, so it has its dogma, out of which there is no salvation: the abolition of individual property replaced by collective property; the universal salary under the authority of the State, sole employer, master of all salaries, distributer of work, only ruler of pleasure and rest.

The Eden dreamt of by Karl Marx has a sort of likeness to a bagnio which has no attraction whatever for the radical socialists. Far from wishing the suppression of individual property which he looks upon "as being the primordial condition of individual development and human progress," Clémenceau endeavors to universalize it or at least to make it more accessible to every one. He is in favor of old workers' pensions, of a more equitable regulation of work, of a greater freedom for the discussion of salaries, of a fiscal legislation which would aim at wealth and spare poverty and leave no immunity for any kind of income. In all his writings, in all his speeches, may be felt a deep and sincere pity for human misery.

There is not any doubt that no change in social order can be effected without the *wishing-to-be-better* people disturbing the well-to-do ones. But is not the danger threatening wealth to be found oftener in itself,—in its own selfishness? And is it not another way of defending it than to exact from it the sacrifices necesary to allay the revolts of suffering and hunger? By hesitating before the injustice that a new repartition of wealth might bring on, the *bourgeois* socialism of M. Clémenceau shows that it is ready to sacrifice something. But will this sacrifice prove sufficient?

Not only has a statesman to work out the problem of the intercourse of citizens either with one another or with the national collectivity; his gaze must go beyond the frontier; to insure the existence and freedom of individuals is only half his task; he must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the same time secure the existence and independence of his country. What will be the foreign policy of Clémenceau?

He has intrusted the care of it to M. Stephen Pichon, former contributor to "*La Justice*," who after having distinguished himself both in the press and the tribune, had represented France in foreign lands long enough to be able to be considered as a professional diplomatist.

But the very choice he made of his helpmate of "*La Justice*" reveals that Clémenceau firmly intends to keep the upper hand over our foreign affairs, and a few pessimists have wondered whether this choice and that of General Picquart, which seems to put the War Department also into the hands of the Prime Minister, might not betoken secret designs alarming for the friends of peace.

Clémenceau, who prides himself upon belonging to the tradition of the French revolution, does not forget that, in the time of the *Jacobins, patriot* and *republican* were synonymous words. Assuming the responsibilities of government, his duty is to consider even to the most unlikely contingencies, and if he did not prepare France for them, he would be treacherous to her. The future indeed is not so safe that our statesmen's watchfulness may be lulled to sleep.

However, by the human tendencies of his mind, by the engagements of his past, by the necessities of his reform policy, Clémenceau is a resolute partisan of peace; it is useless to add: of peace with dignity. Never since her reverses has France felt her army to be stronger or in better condition. Never has her intercourse with the powers given her greater security. Our alliance with Russia maintained, the "*entente cordiale*" with England, a friendly reconciliation with Italy, good and fair relations with all powers, such is and remains the basis of our foreign policy. But whatever security, on account of its army and alliances, may French democracy feel, it is, above all, peaceful and industrious; nobody would succeed in involving it in an adventurous course; if among the difficulties of the present hour, its confidence has been given to Clémenceau, the reason of it is that Clémenceau is expected to lead to success, through peace with all nations, a policy of reforms and social advancement.

L. ANDRIEUX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLEA FOR THE FILIPINOS.

BY GENERAL W. H. CARTER, U.S.A.

AMERICA has already had several sharp lessons tending to show that a seat at the council-table as a world power carries with it duties of the gravest character, involving as their very essence preparedness for war on land and sea. As part of this preparation, if we are to maintain the position assumed in the Orient, bases of supply must always be provided. The retention of such bases in the Philippines in the midst of a half-hearted or disloyal population would in any war demand a large army and an enormous outlay for its transportation and maintenance. We have it in our power to ameliorate conditions and to avoid such a contingency if we but act unselfishly.

Whether or not the interests of eighty millions of people, whose prosperity is so great that the transportation lines cannot carry its overflowing volume of business, demand that their Oriental wards shall continue to be deprived of simple justice may, in the minds of theorists, possibly admit of continued academic argument.

Dire necessity has made men commit wrongs since crimes were first defined by law. Since the dawn of history horrible wars have occurred through the rising of a populace against supposed grievances. It behooves a nation, as a mere matter of public policy, to prevent the harboring of long-continued discontent, for the purpose of preserving loyalty if for no better reasons. Loyalty to the Government should not be expected of any population which, however erroneously, believes itself deprived of equal rights with others living under the same flag.

It has been repeatedly explained by responsible public officials that American occupation of the Philippine Islands has deprived Filipinos of the benefits formerly derived from the Spanish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

markets; that our tariff wall is just high enough to prevent participation in American markets and, as a consequence, many fields lie fallow and a large portion of an hitherto self-supporting agricultural population are leading a half-nourished existence and losing such habits of industry as had become instilled by regular employment. Discontent with existing business conditions and wide-spread poverty amongst those who have experienced a considerable degree of prosperity under the old régime add to the spirit of unrest.

A generous business instinct, if not the old American idea of fair play, should dictate an early removal of the sense of wrong existing in many parts of the Philippines. As the matter now stands, American rule appears to the discontented portion of the population as synonymous with a higher cost of government, increased expense of living and decreased earning capacity. It is useless to further attribute these conditions to the loss of farm animals, the destructive effects of war and the dire results of cholera, for the Filipinos have been taught by the Americans themselves to look to Congress for the relief which they believe alone will modify the existing depression and revive business throughout the islands.

The enormous labors of the Civil government of the islands remain unappreciated in the minds of the discontented, and much that could be done in many provinces, even under present conditions, to assist the government remains unperformed. It has been a long, hard campaign on the part of the American officials, and a little generosity now may place their fields of endeavor amongst those won. On the other hand, a failure to remove some of the barriers complained of may so deepen the conviction that our people are selfish, and that the slogan of "The Philippines for the Filipinos" is but a hollow promise, that even the privilege of presenting their grievances in the coming assembly will not suffice to win a sense of loyalty.

Civil officials, army officers and those who have recently visited the Philippines for purposes of study, are amazed upon returning to America at the general indifference concerning those wards to whom we as a nation so recently committed ourselves through a policy of benevolent assimilation. While in the Philippines, in actual contact with the conditions and sentiment, no educated American can bring himself to the belief that any great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

body of the people at home approve of a policy more fatal than actual hostilities in the tropical islands which were dropped into the nation's lap as an incident of war.

Men in public life generally regarded the reelection of President McKinley in 1900 as settling the question of the retention of the Philippines, yet the impression now produced by the average conversation on the subject amongst professional and business men is that they are tired of the islands and their tangled questions, and would welcome any honorable method of relief from further expense and annoyance incident to the administration of those distant possessions. Can justice be done the millions of Filipinos looking to the American Congress for relief so long as intelligent constituencies misunderstand or are indifferent to the question and adverse commercial interests are active in opposition?

If the Filipinos were on this continent their interests would unquestionably have to take the same chances as others, standing on the great middle ground between tariff reforms and opposition to any modification of schedules. But they are not citizens with all the influence that American citizenship carries, in aiding representatives to formulate legislation in accord with public opinion. Without political influence their progress or decay can exercise little weight upon the careers of public men responsible for the nation's policies, and their appeal for justice must rest almost wholly upon high moral grounds.

The aboriginal American, from Colonial days down to the last Indian war, was wont to kill his captives or adopt them into the tribe to share alike in the general prosperity or suffer in the common defeat, they being deprived only of seats in the tribal council. Is the mad struggle for commercial and industrial supremacy to be allowed to put the nation, whose intellect and ability have given the world so wonderful an exhibition of modern progress, in a class below the savage red men who were driven back and displaced in turn from every hunting-ground from Plymouth Rock and Jamestown to the Golden Gate?

The only honorable explanation which can be made by those in actual contact with the more intelligent and progressive Filipinos, concerning our failure to make good President McKinley's benevolent policy, is, that the American people do not yet comprehend the real situation in the islands, and that when they do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

acquire the necessary knowledge, special interests will no longer control, unless it can be established beyond a reasonable doubt that the upbuilding of industries in the Philippines will work a positive and direct injury to actual vested rights in America.

When the small area of the Philippines adapted to the production of sugar, tobacco and rice is considered, it seems preposterous that the volume of trade in these commodities can ever become sufficiently great to be a noticeable factor in competition with like articles of home consumption. If the investigations of experts leave any doubt as to this, it is entirely practicable to limit the volume of trade which shall be permitted in any article at a reduced tariff rate, existing schedules to be applied to the excess importations.

It has been clearly shown by the officials, whose duty it is to render reports, that there is no probability of rice importations ever being made from the Philippines. The quantity produced under the most favorable conditions will barely meet the needs of home consumption in the islands, and, in any event, the quality of the native rice is not such as to recommend it for importation in competition with the rice produced in the Gulf States.

Hemp, sugar, tobacco and cocoanuts constitute the great volume of Philippine exports. There is no question of competition in the first and last named articles, and the extent of any possible injury to American interests, which might result from lowering tariff barriers on sugar and tobacco, can only be determined by actual experience. However, the adverse trade conditions in sugar and tobacco have an indirect but positive effect upon the hemp, copra and all other industries, which suffer from the general uncertainty and consequent apathy.

Americans quite generally rejoiced at the acquisition of the Philippines, not in anticipation of any material gain, but under the belief that the eradication of the evils of Spanish misrule was a heaven-sent mission. No nation was ever more astonished that ours when the insurrection against American rule took place, and it is safe to say that, with exception of a small element, Americans generally considered the Filipinos unappreciative of the great benefits to be derived from our control, if not absolutely ungrateful of the privilege of living under the protection of the stars and stripes. As time passed and the insurrection was suppressed, Civil rule was established, schools were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opened, expensive but much-needed improvements inaugurated and an honest and serious effort made to convince the islanders of the sincerity of our professions, and that the Philippines for the Filipinos was no vapid utterance but a living and virile policy, for the guidance of all Americans called to the duty of administering the islands.

Mistakes have been made and here and there a petty crime committed in the detailed administration of the islands, but a fair consideration of the untrained men at hand, available to carry on the work of government, only causes surprise that errors of judgment and lapses of principle have not been more frequent. A nation, equally with an individual, can build only with the tools and materials available in the day and generation.

That the results have sometimes been received with impatience by Filipinos as well as by many Americans is not to be denied. The cost of administering the islands, including the expenses of the army and navy, when compared with any possible future income, has presented a discouraging balance-sheet. One of the direct results of these conditions and of certain restrictive provisions of existing legislation has been to discourage the introduction of American energy and capital. The small participation of Americans in the business of the islands is really discreditable to us as a nation. The export trade is almost wholly controlled by British, Spanish, German, Chinese and other foreign houses, neither Americans nor Filipinos having any serious commercial interests. The operations of the Filipinos are confined almost wholly to agriculture and the professions.

No man with business instincts can study the situation in the Orient without reaching the conviction that China is the natural outlet for a great part of the products of the Philippines. In both China and Japan there lie great undeveloped sugar-markets which may yet be captured by enterprising rivals not so favorably located, while the Philippines still remain victims of not only our tariff schedules but of certain other laws involving the international relations of America with China and Japan. Questions of policy, as to admission of Chinese and Japanese immigrants at American ports, should have no bearing on the internal affairs of the Philippines, yet the very fact of being under the American flag embraces them within the limits of every discrimination against trade, in revenge for exclusion acts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The awakening of China, with its teeming millions, is at hand, and a failure to utilize the opportunities of the immediate future may result in the passing of the propitious moment. The flow of trade is not always on the shortest lines, but along those of least resistance. The wonderful development of their merchant marine enables England, Germany or France to rapidly overcome the longer distance whenever it may be profitable for any of them to do so.

Notwithstanding occasional outbreaks of Pulajanes or fanatical hill tribes, and disorders by thieving bands known as Ladrones, public order exists in the islands to an unprecedented degree. These outbreaks occur at wide-spread points, at intervals, but should not be regarded as reflecting the general situation as to public safety any more than Indian raids, train robberies or race riots do that of the peace conditions of the United States.

With the tariff barriers lowered or swept away and the land laws amended the field of enterprise may be sufficiently tempting to induce American capital and energy to a wider participation in the development of the abundant resources of the islands. The restoration of old estates and development of new enterprises should provide legitimate work, in accustomed fields, for thousands of idle laborers. Material prosperity will tend to destroy the influence of political agitators and bind the great body of property-holders and their employees to the government by ties of common interest.

In the final analysis of the situation we have about come to the parting of the ways. Whether or not it be true, the Filipino people regard themselves as victims of American greed and that our altruistic professions do not accord with our practice. Will the people of this great country, through their representatives, deal generously and justly by the Filipinos and give them a chance to share in some of the world's prosperity, or shall the present short-sighted policy be adhered to, with a certainty of closing every avenue leading to loyalty, respect and affection for America and Americans? Those who are indifferent now should be not impatient when the hour of reckoning arrives, for a continuance of present conditions is a Fabian policy fatal alike from a commercial or military view-point.

W. H. CARTER, U.S.A.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ACUTENESS OF THE NEGRO QUESTION: A SUGGESTED REMEDY.

BY WILLIAM DORSEY JELKS, EX-GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA.

ONE thing may be taken for granted in discussing the ever-present race question, in so far as that question affects the people who live in the Southern States: that is, that there is no social equality and that there will be none for any day which can be foreseen. No day will come within this generation or the next when negroes will be unprovided with separate coaches on roads, a division of seats in street-cars, separate hotels and at least separate sections at playhouses. We may say that this law of separation is written in the blood of the whites and is ineradicable.

Much less shall there be terms of intimacy in the family. The white man's table is not for the negro. Whatever may be the virtues of any colored man, or however admirable he may be from many standpoints, he is not for a place at the white man's fireside or the white man's table. These intimacies would mean that he is fit for the white man's daughter. After an evening meal so surrounded or attended one can hear the head of the house exclaim: "I have supped full of horrors." There may be people, there are people, who do not comprehend this feeling. They say they do not get our angle of view. Strive as they may, they cannot see the matter as we do. My people find it even more difficult to understand the Easterner's view.

However others feel about it, it is settled that we will not have any suggestion of social equality in the South. To this extent there must be unending separation of the races. We have drawn a circle about us and propose to control this feature, at least, and control it above other important matters of our life. We will not even discuss riding in the same coach, sleeping at the same hotel, eating at the same table or studying at the same school.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And there can be no political equality, as a matter of fact. There is none now in most of the Southern States, and those States which have not done so are preparing to practically disfranchise the negro race, or certainly the less intelligent and less worthy portion of it.

It would be far better if the two races could be separated. The tension between them in most of the Southern States has been very great, though less serious in Alabama than in other Southern States, and less serious now than in the early part or middle of last year. Aside from this view, and for other reasons which might be named that prompt me to wish a separation, the negro could grow in a home of his own. At least he would have an opportunity to do so, and, less pessimistic than others, I believe that he might achieve a fair government. I know what is said of his incapacity for government. I bear in mind that in his native home, where he has been the absolute master for centuries, he has constructed no system of architecture or currency, rejoiced in no sweet songs, painted no great pictures, had no schools, established no great charities and contrived only the most primitive form of tribal rule. Notwithstanding this terrific indictment, with the schooling he has had in the United States, he might, after all, building on his own efforts, aspirations and responsibilities, found a society which would be sufficient for his comfort and happiness.

I should welcome, on some surprising and sunny morning, the presence of an air-ship at every cabin door to bear these people away to some happy land of their own. We might hope that, after a hundred years in this half-way home, they would construct and build a government satisfactory for their purposes. A great caravan of air-ships would bring opportunity to the colored man and blessings to the race left behind.

But the air-ship will not come; nor will the South be drained of the negroes as suggested by Senator Morgan; or, if it is to be drained, the end will be so indefinitely in the future that it is hardly worth while to discuss the suggestion now. The Senator's plan was to assist a few to some one of the Philippine Islands where the natives would welcome them, or to some portion of Africa; these, prospering, would furnish an invitation which would finally drain this country of all its Afro-American population. Nor yet will the question be settled, as has been suggested

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recently in a magazine article, by dividing the Southern States between the whites and the blacks. If any white people are to give up their homes for the exclusive use of the black man, why not the white people of Massachusetts or Vermont? Citizens of these two States are as much responsible for the negro's presence here as citizens of Alabama or Georgia. Have the whites of Alabama any less right to their own homes than, say, the people of New England? The writer alluded to is very generous with territory of which he owns no part, and with other people's homes. Under certain conditions, that is, if the two races cannot live their lives in the South as he thinks they ought, then the soil of several States should be taken from the whites and given over to exclusive negro purposes and uses. "It is idiotic," he writes, "to talk of deporting negroes to some other country." Why not as "idiotic" to talk of deporting white men? The nearness of one Southern State to another need not figure in the calculation. What is one more night out to a man who is on his way to a home in New England?

Any talk of any kind of deportation is idiotic, I quite agree. We are to live here and together, and that means that the races must have a better understanding with each other. The education of the negro has made him a burden, or, to express it differently, far less valuable as a citizen. The farm is the one opening for him, and this, when he has acquired a smattering of letters, he leaves. He congregates in the towns and leads for the most part an idle life, and, in large numbers, a vicious life. Teaching him to read has thus far proven a curse to the material interests of the South, and this beyond the cost of the schools. The hope many had lay in the expectation that a second and third generation that could read would mark a distinct improvement on the first. We are yet to learn if this hope is groundless. Books have given us a larger proportion of vagrants, and a larger proportion of thieves as well. The non-producers are all thieves. It is the presence of these two offences, and not the more serious crimes, that interrupts the cordial relations of the races and strains the situation to the breaking-point. Assaults on women are not, primarily, the provoking cause of mob law. This statement will surprise some people, but it is true. No statement is safer. The tension is produced by the nagging small offences which are with us every day, and which we seem powerless to defend our-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves against. One cannot hope to take up again even a potato, once it is laid down, if he omits the precaution of putting a padlock upon it, and this is the case in town or country. Those of the colored race who will not themselves commit these petty offences have not been willing, knowing the culprits, to turn them over to the law. The whole negro family is charged with standing together to protect the criminals. The absolute knowledge of this union of the negro race against the law was the primary cause of the Atlanta riot, and is the underlying cause of almost every lynching that has taken place. Given this feeling and an assault to rape, and the smothered fires break loose!

During the greater part of the six years which I served as Governor of Alabama, I had repeated talks with leading colored men and kept up a correspondence with others throughout the State, to the end that I might get their cooperation with conservative white men in the interest of law and order. From whatever cause, it is true that the relations of the races are smoother and more kindly in Alabama than in any other Southern State, and there have been fewer lynchings in this State than in any of our neighbors during the six years covering my particular observation. There are good law-abiding men and women among them—many of them—and they want to live in peace; I find a growing disposition, too, to give up the law-breakers and to make common cause with the officers of the law. These have been heretofore overawed by the less decent element. They are preparing now to whip the thieves out of their church congregations and to scorn the loafers from their societies.

Those who have not had the deplorable experience cannot understand what it means to have an army of vagrants always among them. Out of a population in the capital city of Alabama of perhaps four thousand negro males, grown, more than one thousand of the men do not work at all, to say nothing of the women. Fifty per cent. of the other three thousand do not work three days in the week, and they are without any visible means of support. This situation is duplicated in every town in Alabama. They must live. They live on the white people, practically none of them on their own race. They constitute in the State a vast and growing army—an army larger than the one Lee surrendered at Appomattox and perhaps as large as the one the great Captain brought away from the burning Kremlin. Our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vagrants must go. They bear upon us too heavily. About every fourth working-man, in his fight for better conditions for himself and his family, is bearing one of the non-producers on his back. They must reform or go. They are the people who are breaking the back of peace. If they fail to work or leave, we are on the verge of a dreadful upheaval.

Our negro schools have not taught men the love of work, nor do they seem to be impressing upon them respect for the Commandments. The colored pulpit, speaking of it generally, leads no crusade against theft. It is impossible to assume, and no man at all familiar with the conditions believes it possible to assume, that theft and vagrancy could be so common if proper respect for the mandates written in stone on Sinai was taught either in the pulpit or the schools. The boys and girls lack home training. We cannot reach that condition until we have reached the future heads of families. They lack religious training, and we cannot control the negro pulpit. We cannot prevent free speech.

There is a remedy. The schools are taught by means of money from the State's strong-box. We can reach the teacher. We can insist that no school shall be taught by a man who is not properly impressed with the beauty and dignity of manual labor, and who does not consider the thief as a proper subject for present and eternal punishment. In Alabama, the schools have not been so taught. The negro teacher, for the most part, has either taught the beauty of idleness and the decency of theft, or has, at least, made no impression to the contrary on the plastic mind of the child. It is far better to have a citizenship which is honest than one which can read. Illiteracy is not the greatest evil. No school is properly taught from which the children can emerge without respect for constituted authority and human statutes, to say nothing of the higher law.

Their worship in the churches is picturesque. They rejoice in songs and hallelujahs, and are most happy. They are discriminating in their selection of passages from Holy Writ. They by no means enjoy equally all parts of the gospels and epistles. That passage from one of the epistles that informs them that "they may know they have passed from death unto life if they love the brethren" is one of the most comforting. They read it literally, and allow themselves some indifference to the mere "thou shalt nots." They find in the passage a suggestion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ample opportunity to work their way by St. Peter without troubling themselves too much with disagreeable, troublesome and downright orders. They love the brethren, and they sing the songs of Zion!

The preachers are afraid to stand up and teach the simpler doctrines. It is easier to waft the imagination of the amiable and loving flock to Heaven, on beds of oratorical and musical flowers, than to command its members to take up the cross and suffer. To hale one of its members before the bar for lying, adultery or stealing, in one of the average negro churches, is treason. The Shepherd may have an inclination to do so when one of his flock has committed such crimes, but he dare not. The keeping of any of the Commandments is not considered one of the requirements of church-membership, and a pastor who would press the point would lose his place.

We cannot reach the preacher, but we can look after the schools. The teacher must be licensed, and certain requirements as to moral character are set down; when licensed, he can get a school only by selection of school trustees. It is very plain that the negro teacher in Alabama is, for the larger part, totally unfit for the calling. He is doing a destructive work, and taking the State's sacred school money in payment for it. We are thus poisoning the fountain which is to supply our future citizenship! The schools are turning out thieves and vagrants in companies, battalions and armies. The negro school, still speaking generally, has no influence in making more valuable citizens. On the contrary, there could have been no more of these lawbreakers if there had been no schools among them for forty years! It is perfectly plain that the results prove that the pupils from the vast majority of the negro schools have been imbued in no wise with a sense of the dignity of labor or the propriety and advantage of obeying divine and human laws. Shall such teachers be allowed to do this destructive work further?

We cannot refuse the negro a primary education. He must have that, not in the interest of himself so much, as of the State. He should get it through preceptors who not only keep the laws themselves, but are brave enough to make respect for law the atmosphere of the schoolrooms.

It is not intended to express the belief that all public schools taught by negroes are subject to this criticism. The two leading

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

institutions for negroes in Alabama and presided over by negroes are, so far as I can judge, doing a clean, good work. Their graduates, in character, are far above their people about them. They are the leaders of their race in good works. This is indubitably true.

After changing some views through the years, I am now distinctly of the opinion that Southern white men must teach the negro schools. I say "Southern," because my observation is that Eastern white men and women are mischief-makers. They do not understand the negro character, and they cannot understand it.

Will Southern white men undertake the work? There is much prejudice against it. It can be removed. The Teachers Association in Alabama will discuss the question at its next State meeting, and, I believe, will resolve that it is the patriotic duty of Southern white men—not white women—to engage in this reformatory work. Teaching is one of the great professions. There is only one that is higher. If it be such a great calling, to teach a negro how to become a good citizen ought not to be considered a less honorable pursuit than merchandizing or farming. The white preacher goes at the sick man's call and the white doctor; and charitable women, thousands of them within my personal knowledge, and of my own family, wait upon those who, from poverty or illness, need them. To teach them should be considered a leading work of the State!

I know of no other remedy as certain, if it be only partial. Besides being only partial, it has the disadvantage of being no speedy cure. It is a remedy of years. In the mean time, and until their future men and women can make an impress on their kind, the conservatives of both races must get together looking to a common fight against the violators of any of the large or small provisions of the statutes. The two races together can win this fight! With positive forbearance and justice on the part of the whites, and a determination to make common cause with the law officers on the part of honorable blacks, the two races together can hold anarchy in check, until future colored men and women have had opportunity to learn a different way from different schools. As I have said, the feeling is far less intense now than it was a year ago, and it appears that we are moving into smoother waters.

WILLIAM DORSEY JELKS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHAKESPEARE AGAINST HIS EDITORS.

BY JOHN CORBIN.

If you would know the heights and the depths of human intelligence, said Fielding, read Shakespeare and his editors. The judgment is extreme; but it may serve as a text for a gentle remonstrance against certain persistent and almost universal tendencies of the learned world. For two centuries it has been the custom to regard Shakespeare only as a book to be read. Yet, imperfect as is the record of his life, enough remains to show that his own view was far different. Scrupulously careful though he was in the public presentation of his narrative poems, there is no evidence that he ever willingly permitted one of his dramas to be published, or that he read a line of the proof. The sixteen quartos that were issued during his lifetime were, as it seems, either pirated or intended to forestall piracy. The Baconians have made much of this, as usual turning its obvious sense quite topsyturvy. Canonical editors have been scarcely more discriminating. "Why didn't the brute edit his own works?" Dr. Furnivall once exclaimed over a cup of tea in the British Museum. "He could have done it in a month, and spared us poor devils the bother of centuries." Then he added, with characteristic exuberance, "There are times when I wish I could stand him up in the corner there and punch his head for him!"

One reason why Shakespeare did not edit his own works may have been that he was not aware that they were works. Ben Jonson was the first to speak of his dramas as such—his own dramas, that is—and thereby became the butt of much sly satire at the hands of his fellows of the theatre. Shakespeare wrote plays. He was part owner and manager of a company of actors, and, like all practical playwrights, even in this present day of strict copyright regulation, he was unwilling to give out the text

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a piece while it was alive on the boards. It was enough that his plays should live in the eyes and ears of the theatregoing public. To regard the Shakespearian drama solely from the point of view of the library is to regard it in a perspective at once inadequate and false.

I.

That, in certain fields, the labors of the editors have been fruitful is manifest. The chronology of the plays, and the development of Shakespeare's genius in comparison with that of the age he lived in, have been approximately fixed. The evolution of certain pieces from archaic originals, as, for instance, "Romeo and Juliet" and "Hamlet," has been pretty clearly traced. The importance of such results in the history of dramatic literature and in the literary biography of the dramatist is scarcely to be exaggerated.

The chief efforts of the commentators, however, have been spent in purifying the text, which it has been the custom to regard as deplorably corrupt; and here the results have not been of the happiest. For two centuries patient, diligent and pious scholars have exhausted ingenuity, and even phantasy, in the hope of making sense of what they did not understand; but the learned world itself is at last awaking to the fact that the Folio is measurably authentic and pure. Its errors are for the most part self-evident. Hopeless corruptions are rare. Says Furness, in the preface of his Variorum edition of "Love's Labor Lost" (1904):

> "This whole question of the text has gradually subsided. . . . The number of lines in Shakespeare's dramas and poems, as given in the Globe edition, has been computed to be one hundred and fourteen thousand four hundred and two (114,402). . . . Those marked with an obelus, as hopelessly corrupt, number about one hundred and thirty, which means that there is only one obstinately refractory line or passage in every eight hundred and eighty."

This Furness regards as the most liberal possible allowance. "It is small wonder," he concludes, "that the denunciation of Shakespeare's defective text is becoming of the faintest." It was the realization of all this which, after many years, led Furness to give up his attempt to unite in his Variorum all the successful emendations. In his later volumes he has reproduced the original text intact, reducing the emendations to foot-notes.

The hopelessly corrupt passages, it will be seen, average only a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fraction more than three to each play. To what extent they impair the acting value may best be judged by the improvement effected in the most successful of the emendations. In describing Falstaff's death, the Hostess, according to the Folio text, says: "His nose was as sharpe as a Pen, and a Table of greene fields." Theobald conjectured that this should have read: "His nose was as sharp as a pen, and a bable of greene fields." By the change of a single letter, utter nonsense becomes one of the most illuminating of the finer traits in the portrait of the greatest of Shakespeare's comic characters. This emendation, with two or three others distinctly less notable, has rescued Theobald from the ignominy Pope heaped upon him in making him the first hero of the "Dunciad," and placed him at the head of those who have labored with Shakespeare's text — which, in spite of our rubric, must be reckoned as vastly more than the kingship of dunces! But, deeply illuminating as the emended reading is to the leisurely and literary imagination, it may be questioned whether it has any great dramatic force. On the boards, imaginative value resides chiefly in the skill and speed with which the story is developed, the saliency and contrasts in the presentation of character, and the larger sweeps of laughter or passion. It is scarcely too much to say that the combined work of the editors has not enriched the acting value of the plays by one burst of merriment, one pulse of emotion. From the point of view of Shakespeare, the maker and manager of plays, the textual labors of two centuries, even supposing them to have removed all errors, might well have been—scarcely worth the labor of editing his "works."

II.

Little of positive good as the editors have accomplished, moreover, they have in many instances foisted fresh errors upon the text. According to one familiar anecdote, a worthy German found only nonsense in the line:

> "Sermons in stones, and books in the running brooks."

He changed it to read:

> "Sermons in books, and stones in the running brooks."

This is, perhaps, a fable; but it illustrates none the less aptly the whims and mares' nests of the emending imagination. Such foibles, it is true, the best editors avoid; but when, as character-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istically happens in all good acting plays, the point of a passage depends upon even the most obvious detail of stagecraft, they one and all run into errors which have not yet been detected. To cite one of innumerable minor instances, when Polonius comes in upon Laertes, taking leave of Ophelia, he says:

> "Yet heere, Laertes? Aboord, aboord for shame,
> The winde sits in the shoulder of your saile,
> And you are staid for there: my blessing with you;
> And these few precepts," etc.

With a grammatical sense that would do credit to a nursery governess, Theobald pointed out that the antecedent of "there" is the shoulder of the sail, and that Shakespeare could hardly have meant that any one was waiting for Laertes in so ticklish a place. He punctuates the line:

> "And you are staid for. There; my blessing with you!"

He has been followed by his successors, even Furness and the "Cambridge" editors, with the exception of Corson and the "First Folio" editors. The difference is of no great moment; but it very aptly illustrates the sort of things that happen when plays are regarded as works. Here, as everywhere in the Elizabethan drama, the lines were written with actor and stage in mind. The grammar is that of the spoken word, and the punctuation a matter of voice and action. It needs only a gesture from the profuse old councillor to indicate that "there" refers to the docks. As presented in the Folio, the word adds its quota to the sense. With the revised punctuation, it is redundant.

When the most scrupulous of editors sink into such a pitfall, it is scarcely to be wondered at that one and all err in dealing with matters that involve a special knowledge of our ancient dramaturgy. With the main features of Shakespeare's stage they are not unacquainted; but the stagecraft of which these are only the outward sign is a closed book to them. In the entire Elizabethan drama there is not one scene that calls for the realistic pictorial setting familiar to the post-Restoration theatre; but the first of the editors, Rowe (1709), indicated, in an irregular and haphazard manner, the definite room, street, or what-not, in which, he would have us believe, Shakespeare meant us to imagine the action as taking place; and his successors, down to the present day, have carried on the work, introducing scenes persistently,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at every possible opening. Frequently this does no harm, and, as far as the reader is concerned, may be reckoned of value in that it gives the action a local atmosphere. But, in numerous instances, it pointedly misrepresents Shakespeare's intention as a dramatist.

In the fifth scene of the last act of "Macbeth," the sorely beset monarch enters, accompanied by "souldiers with drum and colours," and says:

> "Hang out our Banners on the outward walls,
> The Cry is still, they come."

This scene the editors, without a single exception that I can find, place in a room in the castle. Keightley, troubled by the knowledge that the banners were characteristically hung, not from the walls, but from the tower, makes the passage read:

> "Hang out the banners. On the outward walls
> The cry is still, they come."

If the editors had reasoned from the point of view of Shakespeare the playwright, this punctuation—to begin with the matter they regard as of most moment—would not have been possible. At the back of the stage, as they well know, was a gallery which, in innumerable instances, was used to represent the wall of a garden, castle or city. To any one who keeps in mind the details of Elizabethan stagecraft, the natural supposition is that Macbeth and his followers entered on this gallery. As much of scenic locality as Shakespeare intended to create is indicated in the opening line, and in the action of hanging out the banners. The punctuation is as right as right can be.

Keightley's injury to the text, however, is a bagatelle in comparison to the injury which all the editors have done to the acting value of the passage. By placing the scene in a castle room, they require that an entirely new set be shifted upon the stage for some forty-five lines, after which the scene is again shifted to the exterior of the castle. To say nothing of the expense in scenery and manipulation, the result is to retard the action at its climax. As Shakespeare planned the passage, these two scenes are one. Macbeth's exit from the wall above is instantly followed by the entrance of Malcolm, Seyward and Macduff beneath. After they have spoken a dozen lines, Macbeth issues from the castle, with his desperate new resolution to meet his foes in the open. From

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the hanging out of the banners, the action proceeds with rapid and cumulative interest, until Macbeth is slain and Malcolm hailed as King. A thousand niceties of punctuation and verbiage are as nothing in comparison with the value of a vigorous dramatic climax.

III.

In "Romeo and Juliet," the casualties to the text have reached a climax. With one glad accord the editors have cut into two, and even three, parts scenes which were obviously planned as climacteric dramatic units.

In one case—Romeo's first adventure into the orchard of the Capulets—they have, with a recklessness incredible even in an editor of Shakespeare, actually called for a shift of scenery between the lines of a couplet. The first scene they call "A Lane by the Wall of Capulet's Orchard." Romeo enters, speaks two lines, and then, according to the editors, "climbs the wall, and leaps down within it." The proceeding cannot be made to seem agile in the acting, in spite of the cleats amiably supplied by the stage carpenter; and the back is not the best part of a Romeo, especially when seen in certain altitudes. But the editors say "Climb!" and Romeo climbs. Then Benvolio and Mercutio come in and deliver their comradely chaff about Rosaline—at the blank wall over which Romeo has just clambered. After a few speeches they go out, Benvolio exclaiming:

"'Tis in vain
To seek him here who means not to be found."

Hereupon, according to the editors, the scene shifts to the interior of the orchard. Benvolio's last line is quite forgotten, when, after the interval, Romeo gives the answering rhyme:

"He jests at scars who never felt a wound."

Then Juliet appears at the window. The passage that follows is one of consummate poetical illusion; but, when Romeo assures Juliet in amorous pleasantry,

"With love's light wings did I o'erperch these walls,"

the friendliest of audiences, remembering the cleats and Romeo's laboring back, is prone to smile.

How did Shakespeare intend all this to be done? Any one who has a clear picture of the Elizabethan stage in his eye, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a little feeling for Elizabethan stagecraft, will guess at once that the wall was represented, as walls always were, by the gallery at the back of the stage—though none of the editors has shown this perspicacity. On his entrance, Romeo is already "aloft," and thus avoids a public clamber. As for "o'erperching" the wall, as if on "love's light wings," when the top has once been gained in the obscurity of the tiring-house, that is a feat within the athletic grace of even an operatic tenor. At the sound of his pursuing friends, Romeo leaps down into the garden and hides in the shrubbery. They also appear on top of the wall, and it is from this point of vantage that they chaff him about Rosaline. Note how this arrangement brings out the comedy of the situation. Though Romeo is shadowed from his pursuers, he is in plain view of the audience. The fact that he is reminded of the lately adored Rosaline's bright eye and her other parts of beauty, even while mooning beneath Juliet's window, is thus projected with the utmost effect. The least look of being teased could not fail to amuse. It is out of a mood of instant annoyance at their raillery, and of chagrin at his broken vows of constancy, that Romeo replies to the receding Benvolio:

"*He jests at scars that never felt a wound*"—

a line that, in the modern arrangement, after the tedious interruption of the scene-shifter, is quite unintelligible. How many, even of Shakespeare's readers, have caught its full force? It may be remarked in passing that the scene is not properly called a balcony scene. The phrase originated in a mistaken notion that Juliet appears in the gallery at the back of the stage, which, as we have seen, was used for the orchard wall. Juliet appears in an upper box at the side of the stage, which for the nonce represented her chamber window—as is evident in Romeo's line:

"But soft, what light through yonder window breaks!"

and again, Act III, scene V,

"Then, window, let day in, and let life out."

A similar misunderstanding of Shakespeare's dramaturgy is no less damaging to the effect of the subsequent scene involving this so-called balcony. The editors are about equally divided as to whether the stage should represent Juliet's chamber overlooking the garden, or the garden itself, overlooked by Juliet's cham-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber. Those who, like Furness in his Variorum, decide for the chamber run into the absurdity of making Romeo speak his three speeches of passionate farewell after he "descends" out of view of the audience, and somewhat, of course, out of its hearing. That he has descended there can be no doubt. The Quarto says, "He goeth down," and Juliet says, in both texts:

> "Methinks I see thee, now thou art below,
> Like one dead in the bottom of a tomb."

Those who place the scene in the garden, as, for example, the "Cambridge" editors do, have far better warrant, for the Folio says, "Enter Romeo and Juliet aloft." But they run into an even greater theatric difficulty, for their subsequent stage directions distinctly imply that the long wrangling scene between Juliet and her parents, in which the Nurse also appears, takes place with all three heads sticking out of the window!

The Quarto furnishes a key to the difficulty. The stage, as it seems, represents the garden; the stage direction reads: "Enter Romeo and Juliet at the window." After Romeo has departed, the directions say: "Enter Nurse, hastily"—and haste implies that she enters below; for how is an actor to indicate a hasty entrance at the window where Juliet is already standing? The Nurse says:

> "Madam, beware, take heed the day is broke,
> Your Mother's comming to your Chamber, make all sure."

The Quarto adds: "She goeth down from the window"; and, if we are right in supposing that the Nurse had entered below, "she" can only mean Juliet. Then follows in the Quarto text a decorative design which, elsewhere, is always used to indicate that the stage is for a moment empty. After it we find: "Enter Juliets mother, Nurse," which, as all three immediately speak, is clearly one of the minor typographic errors in which the text abounds. It should read: "Enter Juliet, Mother, Nurse," the comma having been taken for an "s." In other words, the Nurse, having warned Juliet to remove the traces of Romeo's presence in the chamber, goes in and fetches her to meet Lady Capulet below in the garden. In the Folio, where the scene is rewritten, the Nurse gives her caution, with far greater dramatic effect, before Romeo's leave-taking, and does not appear again till later, when she comes on with old Capulet; but there is no in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dication that the general scenic arrangement I have indicated has been altered. It is, in fact, the only actable arrangement.

In the potion scene, the arbitrary localities foisted in by the editors have obliterated an effective and curiously Elizabethan bit of dramatic contrast. At the back of the stage, beneath the gallery, as is well known, was a curtained alcove which was used to represent, among other things, an inner chamber. By means of it, Shakespeare here produces a rencontre not dissimilar in principle to the famous screen scene in "The School for Scandal." When Juliet drinks the potion, according to the Quarto, "She fals upon her bed within the Curtaines." For a moment the stage is empty, as is indicated by another of the decorative designs. Then the Nurse comes in with Juliet's mother, followed by old Capulet and a number of serving-men, all engaged in joyous and bustling preparations—matters of spits, logs, and wedding music. The joy of marriage is separated only by a curtain from the image of death! To the modern mind it seems strange that such business should be transacted so near Juliet's chamber. The explanation lies in the much-neglected fact that, on the Elizabethan stage, the sense of definite locality was of the faintest. Presently, the Nurse calls Juliet; and, getting no answer, draws aside the curtains, disclosing Juliet's rigid body. The scene of joyous anticipation turns in a moment to one of utter woe. The County Paris comes in with Friar Laurence and says:

"What, is the bride ready to go to church?"

When he sees his bride apparently dead, the general grief mounts higher. As the Quarto naïvely says: "All at once cry out and wring their hands." At the end of the passage: "They all but the Nurse goe foorthe, casting Rosemary on her and shutting the Curtains."

Not a throb of all this has reached the pulses of the editors. The episode of the wedding preparations they lift bodily and set down in a hall of the mansion, making three short scenes of one, tediously halting the action and obliterating a carefully planned and salient dramatic effect. As cut up by the editors, the play contains no less than twenty-five scenes, to present all of which in one evening, with realistically detailed scenery, is a sheer impossibility. An unusually full modern production, that of Mr. Sothern and Miss Marlowe, gave eighteen scenes, wearily drag-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ging the action out till midnight; but the scene of wedding mirth and bustle is not one of them.*

IV.

That the editors had any regard to the fate of Shakespeare on the stage is not to be imagined; but if it had been their conscious purpose to shelve him in the library, they could not have succeeded better. For where pious and patient students have gone so far astray, actors and managers need not be expected to keep the path of scholarly and artistic rectitude. They have, in fact, bettered the instruction. With the first introduction of pictorial scenery, it became practically necessary to reduce the text to the bare bones in order to make time for the scene-shifter; and, as pictorial realism became more complete in detail, the sacrifice became greater and greater. Many elaborate Shakespeare productions are little more than a collocation of elegant extracts. Even in Germany, where the scenery madness has been held at bay, and where, more than in any other country, culture is permitted to eventuate in boredom, a fair repertory of Shakespeare's plays keeps the boards only by virtue of liberal subvention. In England, those plays alone subsist, the inherent vitality of which enables them to survive much mauling and mangling. The art of the scene-painter is at best a bastard art, but it is popular; and in its flowering time, under Irving and Beerbohm Tree, it has become the chief item of dramatic fare. In addition to the long-honored cutting, scenes are now transposed, almost at random, to lessen the number of shifts—with what damage to the swing of the story and the development of character need not be described.

When Mr. Beerbohm Tree presented "The Tempest" (1904), an intelligent German traveller wrote a letter to a London daily paper charging that the effect of so much splendor was to obliterate the poetry. Mr. Tree stigmatized the charge as "the reverse of the truth," and argued: "Beautiful plays demand beautiful settings. The whole production is an attempt to make the play entirely intelligible to the audience." In view of the general shortening and rearrangement of the text, these are brave words! But that is not the worst. In order to show the shipwreck in

* With experience it was found necessary to curtail the performance, and among others the scene before Capulet's garden wall went by the board.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

realistic detail—a stoutly built vessel manned by infant sailors and laboring through all the pother of a modern stage storm—he had been obliged to cut the dialogue of this most stirring and characteristic scene entirely, for it was not only beyond the histrionic powers of the piping actors, but, in any case, the words would have been drowned out by stage thunder. The elaborate realization of the passage in which Ariel makes the banquet vanish necessitated such excisions that as acute an observer as Mr. William Archer remarked: "What the meaning of the whole affair is, no human soul can divine!" The intelligence of Mr. Tree's audience, it appears, has not risen above the level of the picture-book. Or is Mr. Tree's own intelligence, or veracity, in question? Give the scenery and manager full swing, and Shakespeare is reduced to the level of the most delectable Christmas pantomine. Sad brow and true critic, the thing these particular beautiful plays least need is such beautiful scenery. One kind office, however, the modern Shakespearian "production" does perform: it blots out defects as surely as it blots out beauties. Bad as are the acting and elocution of our Shakespeare-starved stage, they would seem worse the nearer they were brought to the eye and the ear.

V.

What would Shakespeare himself think of his editors, if he could know the fate they have brought upon his plays? We are told that he was a man of some physical stature, and, as Aubrey reports, "well shap't." If it were a question of physical violence, he would probably be able, under the inspiration of the moment, to meet them all, each in his corner, beginning with Rowe and not ending even with the athletic and bellicose Dr. Furnivall.

The attempt to act the plays as they were meant to be acted has several times been made of late; but never with any real comprehension of the archæologic—to say nothing of the æsthetic—problems involved. The precise nature of Elizabethan dramaturgy, and whether a thoroughly intelligent reproduction of it would be popularly successful, are questions that lie beyond the scope of the present discussion. But as regards the editors, it may be fairly urged that they owe it both to themselves as scholars and to Shakespeare as a dramatist to present his text in accordance with his manifest intention.

JOHN CORBIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONCERNING RACE SUICIDE.

BY CHRISTINE TERHUNE HERRICK.

Not long ago a census-taker called on the mother of three children.

"It doesn't take you as long to make the entries here as in some places," she commented, when he had finished his record.

"No, ma'am. The other day I had a family of seven children to enter. But they were Irish."

"Yes?" said the mother of three. "You don't often find such families as that among Americans."

"And if they had them, where would they put them?" said the man. "There's no allowance made for children in first-class apartments, even if a poor man could afford the rent. The places where he can pay are not where a decent man would like to raise his children. Indeed, I don't know what would become of people if they did have big families any more."

Here is the question that presents itself to impatient readers of utterances on race suicide. Mr. Dooley's remarks concerning the annexation of the Philippines fit the case. "What wud I do wid them? Shure, there isn't room in the bedroom now for me-silf and the bed." Judging from the difficulty some of us find in nourishing and training the few olive branches that scantily shelter our board we would be in desperate plight if we had a nursery full of them.

Profound and impressive have been the fulminations against small families. They are especially weighty when they come from those who with incomes and positions which would justify them in treating themselves to one of the "good old-fashioned families" of twelve or thirteen, choose only a scanty half-dozen or so as their own portion. Only those with little visible means of support are in the habit of presenting fifteen or sixteen chil-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dren to a grateful country which will some day probably be taxed to support them.

Many of us would, with Lady Teazle, be delighted if roses blossomed under our feet and we could have strawberries all the year round. In other words, a large family of children would be a joy, the sight of a long and well-fitted family board a delight, the thought that we were laying up for old age stores of comfort and companionship in the line of children and grandchildren better to us than a bulky bank account. But then we have to own the bank account to compass these luxuries and that there is weekly less probability of our possessing. I say "weekly," for to my own startled apprehension the increase in the cost of every necessity for livelihood mounts with a speed to which Jonah's gourd is the only fit comparison.

I do not like to think of myself as an old woman, and even according to the Osler methods of computation I am not yet really in the sere and yellow leaf. Yet if we should count time by heart throbs or their economic equivalents in experience, I could feel myself a centenarian. Little more than two decades ago I began housekeeping in a house which rented for thirty dollars a month and now commands forty-five. I kept one maid of all work to whom I paid three dollars and a half a week and felt myself a cross between a Croesus and a pauper in the transaction,—a Croesus, in that I could pay such a sum, and a pauper in view of the bourne towards which I felt my outlay was leading me.

I had been accustomed to a generous table and took it for granted that I could not keep house on less than ten dollars a week. This was to pay for gas,—we cooked by a coal-range then,—for ice, milk and all provisions for our family of three. We entertained a good deal. Recently I tried to feed another family of three on a limited sum. Ten dollars a week, with close managing, covered the actual outlay for food, ruling out the ice and milk bills and taking no thought for the gas,—and preciously short commons it was, with none of the extras I took as a matter of course twenty years ago, and with no allowance for company.

Ask the women and you will learn a few formidable truths. First, that unless you go to a "cash butcher's" shop, where you cannot always be sure of the merits of the meat, you

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will pay more for beef, lamb, mutton, veal, poultry, than you did ten years ago, five years ago. "The Beef Trust," we are told, "beef" evidently being a generic term that covers all animals travelling by land and water which are fit for food. But is there a Vegetable Trust? For vegetables are higher than they were even two or three years back. And have the hens a Trust, too? All the threats of manufactured eggs have not availed to lower the prices of the genuine article — whether they be "strictly fresh," "fresh" or simply "eggs." Milk is to most of us two cents a quart higher than it was a few years since. The adulterations of butter that crowd the market should surely make veritable butter less costly, though it has not done so yet. We are told that flour and sugar are no higher, but man cannot live by bread alone, and even sweetness unmixed will not sustain life.

So much for the simple staples. Carry the case further and you fare worse. Look for a moment at service. My mother can remember when eight dollars a month was considered excellent wages for a cook. My memory goes not so far back, but I have clear recollections of the time when sixteen dollars a month was high wages. Now none is so mean as to be satisfied with that except as a temporary measure, until by learning how to make hash masquerade as croquettes, to achieve doubtful pastry and to convert good plain food into a variety of entrees that are distinguished from one another chiefly by their names, the "green" girl becomes entitled to announce herself an experienced cook. Of this experience it is not necessary that a knowledge of how to make a good loaf of bread, a tolerable cup of coffee, or an eatable slice of toast shall be a component part. With all her imperfections on her head—or in her hand—she demands and gets from twenty to thirty dollars a month, and condescends in accepting the smaller sum.

The specialization which has been so highly commended as a cure-all for lack of employment has found its way into our servants' halls as well as everywhere else. The opponents of race suicide do not mention what shall be done with the race while their mother is doing the cooking, washing and ironing because she hasn't the money to pay for a specialized servant. It was with difficulty that persons of small means afforded themselves the luxury of children when they could engage a maid who would do the general housework of the home and perhaps occasionally

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"lend a hand with the baby," so that the mother could get out to church or to needed shopping. But the "general-housework servant" bids fair to take a place with the dodo as an extinct species. If a woman who for any reason is unable to do her own work is obliged to pay—let us make the prices moderate—twenty dollars to her cook and laundress and twenty more to her waitress, when her husband has an income of two thousand a year and spends a fourth of that in house rent, what is there left to do with the race?

A feeling of desperation seizes one at the mere approach to the discussion of house rent. There is the immutable, irreducible, inevitable fardel of the dweller in cities. Poor people must live, and although, with Talleyrand, you may not see the necessity, you cannot rid yourself of the problem by a bitter epigram. And rent is the greatest obstacle in the way of seemly living. In the city it is absolutely impossible for even the moderately poor to get light and air for the sum they can pay, and it borders close on the impossible for those in easier circumstances. It is well enough to talk of air and light as free to every one. In the city there is not enough of either to go around, and those may get who have the power—or the price. Life may be supported without these luxuries and the dwellers in cities long ago ceased to include them among the essentials. A roof over the head, rooms to eat and sleep in, are indispensable, and if they are dark and crowded it is only one of the things with which one must bear.

Even for this sort of accommodation one's income is taxed beyond its powers. Every year the rents mount higher. During the past fifteen years I have seen them go up, up, in my home city. With increased facilities of transportation the land becomes more valuable to the owners, and the cost of living on it is raised to the tenant. One year it was five dollars a month more than it was the year before. Another year it came up only two dollars a month. When it stood still for a year or so one rejoiced with trembling lest the immunity of this year should be made up for by a double increase at the end of the twelvemonth. Never is there a fall in the rent of houses or apartments any more than in the prices of other necessities of life.

"But why not move into the suburbs or the country?" comes the cry. That is the one remedy proposed instantly. So far as the suburbs are concerned, they are rarely less expensive than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the city. To the country a great many persons cannot go—and it does not clear the situation to retort that they would not live there if they could. Putting aside the great armies of laborers in the shops and factories who must be near their work, there are countless others whose employment restricts them to the vicinity of their toil. The motorman or conductor on a car, the letter-carrier, the clerk whose hours are long, the bookkeeper who must be late at his desk, the newspaper man who works at night, the compositor whose hours are the same, are among them. Surely the man and woman who have their dwelling in crowded city streets which afford the worst of playgrounds for their children, who live in close quarters with perhaps one or two light rooms out of the five or six that are all they can pay for, are in no position to become joyful fathers and mothers of children. "Suffer *not* little children to come unto me," ceases to be a satire and become a sorrowful and sincere prayer.

At this point I can hear the horror-stricken protests that this last remark is sure to call forth. Accusations of heartlessness, of unwomanliness, of lack of patriotism, are the least of the charges. "Any one with an income of two thousand dollars a year is in a position to have a family," I am told, in every variety of indignant tones.

Undoubtedly any one ought to be able to have a family on that sum. But having a family is one thing and bringing it up is another. Bringing it up as you would like to have it brought up, giving the children advantages of education, of association, permitting them the rights that are surely theirs when by no will of their own they are brought into a world of doubtful blessing. It is very well to say, with Dr. Lavendar, that we should not grudge young people their unhappiness, and we all of us grant the advantages of more or less discipline. Yet there is a discipline that embitters by the contrast it provokes. The boy who must wear patched clothes and go barefoot when none of his fellows do it, who must be denied the education he craves and put to work to support himself and the younger children, is subjected to a trial beyond his deserts.

We may point with pride to the records of the great Americans who earlier in the history of our country rose to distinction from among the poorest of the land—but we question our own right to subject our children to all that those same great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans went through with before they "arrived." Social circumstances have changed mightily in the last half-century. To say that our half-dozen children who are to be fed and housed and clothed and educated out of that two thousand a year shall be condemned, because of our inability to give them the associations and advantages to which they were born, to struggle through life ill equipped for its contest—what man or woman, looking at the matter calmly and sanely, is willing to put this burden on children yet unborn?

But have not incomes gone up, too? Wages have, in many quarters. Is this the only line in which there has been an increase of income?

I admit the rise in some quarters,—although it is no more in proportion than the rise in the cost of living. But in many callings there has been no rise. Clerks, I am told, receive no higher pay than they have done for years past. I have not heard that the salaries of clergymen or of newspaper men have been increased,—although most physicians have raised their charges. I am sure writers are paid no more by the thousand words than they were ten years back, except in cases where the value of their wares has increased in the estimation of editors. The item of clothing is the one honorable exception which has not gone up higher. One can probably buy materials as reasonably now as one could a decade since. But when it comes to making the garments! Not more than five years ago I paid a dressmaker six dollars when she made me a waist. If it were very elaborate she charged me eight. The other day I went to her again and asked her price for making a plain silk waist with only the simplest trimming. Fourteen dollars! This did not include any of the findings, much less the fabric.

I have not assumed the rôle of a Cassandra, nor do I prophesy with Hetty Green that there is coming a revolution against existing financial conditions when the streets will run with blood. My foresight is not keen. But from the depths of an unscientific and child-loving heart I pray that those who condemn race suicide and cry shame upon American small families would set their big brains to work to check or reduce the increased cost of living and make possible again the large families of the earlier days of the Republic.

CHRISTINE TERHUNE HERRICK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY EX-ATTACHE, OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR AND RICHARD LE GALLIENNE.

A NOVEL OF BRITTANY.*

No more comprehensive illustration of the rôle played by the Paris priest in the rural districts of France has ever been given to the public than that contained in "Gray Mist," the second novel of that writer who, by reason of her devotion to the memory of Elizabeth of Austria, prefers to be known in literature as the author of "The Martyrdom of an Empress."

"Gray Mist" shows us the extent to which the whole life of the little community centres around the rectory. It is thither that the peasant and the fisherman turn their steps for advice and help in every perplexity and every difficulty. They have no secrets from their Curé. Often he has known them from childhood, and has endowed them with whatever education they possess. He has christened, confirmed and married them, he has buried their dear ones, and possesses the most intimate acquaintance with all their domestic affairs, their material interests, their shortcomings, their virtues, their aspirations and fears. He is their chosen guide, and deservedly enjoying their whole-hearted confidence, wields over them an extraordinary influence. Nowhere is this of more advantage to the government than in the ancient Duchy of Brittany, where the population—entirely distinct from that of the remainder of France—is characterized by all the violence of passion, and the fervency of religious belief, peculiar to the Celtic race.

Abbé Kornog is not the hero of the book. But he is undoubtedly its most lovable character, and throughout its pages

* "Gray Mist." By the author of "The Martyrdom of an Empress." New York and London: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he plays a predominant and yet always sympathetic rôle. A reviewer whose knowledge of French conditions and literature is unrivalled in America, has pronounced him "one of the finest creations ever found in fiction." Indeed, the Abbé Kornog is even far more attractive than Ludovic Halévy's Abbé Constantin. For whereas the latter is a bland and gentle old man, who conveys a greater idea of saintliness than of strength, and whose lines, thanks to his rich American parishioners, are cast in pleasant places, the Curé of Kermarioker is a forceful and intensely human nature, the keystone of a poverty-stricken community, composed exclusively of peasants and fisherfolk, whose hardships he shares, and whom, in spite of their suspicious, reserved and rebellious character, he dominates not alone by his sacred office, and by his brain, but also by his brawn. As an illustration of this we are told how he thrashed, and hurled head first on to a manure-heap, the village bully, a burly innkeeper, when the latter, rendered almost insane with rage by the Abbé's action in wrenching a bottle of vile potato brandy from a peasant and breaking it on the ground, had so far forgotten himself as to menace the priest with personal violence. It was during a terrible cholera epidemic at Kermarioker, and the worthy Father was on his way home after a night sad and weary spent ministering as a priest and as a physician to his dying friend Herve Rouzik, whose soul had taken its flight for a better world just as day was breaking. His heart was very heavy. For he had known Rouzik, the foster-father of the hero of the book, from childhood. But when he saw a member of his flock buying potato brandy, the sale of which he had forbidden while the cholera was raging, his anger got the better of his grief, and he then and there used his brawn to enforce the orders which he had issued, not only as Curé, but also in his capacity as a health officer. For at Kermarioker, as in many another remote fishing-village on the rocky, wreck-strewn coast of Brittany, there was no doctor within reach.

"Not for miles and miles, and from the first minute when the scourge appeared, the Curé 'took hold'—as the sailors say—and governed the sick and the well alike, as no other could have done—almost with a rod of iron."

And thus it is in well-nigh every village of that strange, primitive part of France known as Brittany, whenever visited by cholera

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or any other deadly epidemic. The Curé, besides administering the last rites to the dying, acts as physician and as nurse to the sick, converting his rectory into a free dispensary. Thanks to his influence as a Minister of the Church, he is able to exercise an authority in all sanitary matters of the village that no lay health officer could ever hope to wield. He brings consolation to the bereaved, acts as executor of the last wishes of the dead, is *de facto* guardian of the widows and young orphans, secures obedience to the laws of the land from a people impatient of secular authority, and in one word is a very human and therefore sympathetic representative of that Providence to Whom all turn in times of stress and trouble—especially in Brittany. The Curé usually becomes so attached to his flock, that frequently, as in the case of Abbé Kornog, he declines preferment, in order to remain with those among whom he has labored so devotedly, and with such unselfishness. For most of the meagre stipend of 800 francs ($150) a year which the Breton Curés received until a few months ago from the state, went in charity, their parishioners being as a rule too poverty-stricken to contribute anything save an occasional catch of fish, or a basket of vegetables, to the maintenance of their rector.

What they will do without him now it is difficult to say. Yet without stipend from the state, or from his parish, without even church or rectory, how can he remain, unless financial assistance comes from devout Catholics in other and less impoverished parts of France? Not only will the people suffer cruelly from the loss of the one mentor and friend to whom alone they accord their whole trust, and from whom they have derived so much moral and material support; but the Government also will be subjected to no end of difficulty through the disappearance of their most useful agents for the maintenance of order. When the Curé departs, the restraining influence goes, and trouble is almost certain to result, in this strange and romantic region, where less than a third of the population understand and speak French, in fact, only those of the lower classes who have served in the army, and especially in the navy. For Brittany is the latter's nursery, and furnishes far and away the largest proportion of its sailors, the backbone indeed of the French fleet.

Quite appropriately it is the ocean that brings upon the scene Pierrek, whose brief career forms the subject of the drama. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emerges from a bank of gray mist, a little child floating upon the surface of the sea, and so startling and unexpected is the apparition, that the terror-stricken crew of the fishing-boat "Stereden-ab-Vor" precipitately cross themselves, regarding it as the dreaded "Kollidik Apouliek," that is to say, a spectral still-born baby, abandoned by God to Satan, who tosses it for sport far out to sea, to serve as a harbinger of doom to seafaring men. The skipper, however, is of sterner mould, and observing that the child is very much alive, sheers alongside, takes it on board, and adopts it in the place of his own little boy, whose death some time previously had wrecked the mind of his young wife. When he returns to land with the little waif, she sees therein the restoration of her own baby by the sea. And so great is her joy at the recovery of her child, that her reason is restored thereby. The village, moved by compassion, humors her, and even the good Curé has not the heart to undeceive her. This pathetic deception, this pious fraud, constitutes the foundation of the story. Every link of the latter has been welded so deftly into an unbroken chain of apparently logical consequences, that the reader, though impressed with a sense of impending disaster, proceeds as unsuspicious of the terrible dénouement as are the victims thereof themselves, until the final and crushing blow of destiny from a wholly unexpected quarter. The nature of the blow is in itself repellent. Yet it is handled with so much delicacy, so much reticence and so much pathos, that it gradually appears to the cultured reader as the inevitable climax of the story, and that any other would have been unnatural and incongruous.

A remarkable feature of this weird and powerful story, which, unlike most of the novels of the present day, leaves an indelible impression upon the mind, is a degree of restraint, rare in a woman, observed by the author. So much is left to the imagination, so much has been avoided that would have tempted a less gifted writer to intensify the action and to paint it in more lurid colors. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the final pages of the book. Pierrek, when the crisis is reached, does not do murder, nor take his own life—suicide is well-nigh unknown in Catholic Brittany. He enlists for naval service on the fever-stricken rivers and coasts of Cochin-China, and perched in the crosstrees of the cruiser bound for the Orient, vanishes from the gaze of the reader into that Gray Mist from which he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emerged as a baby at the outset of the story—that gray mist so pregnant with poetry and romance, and which the graceful verses which head each chapter of the book so happily describe as "God's veil of mystery." EX-ATTACHE.

"LAFCADIO HEARN."*

THERE could scarcely be found a figure of Lafcadio Hearn's distinction and literary allurement who should be at the same time as well calculated to baffle a biographer. He lived always an alien among aliens. There is little obvious relation between the different periods of his lonely life. He formed strong attachments which in almost every case his curious sensitiveness led him to shatter. A nature to whom self-revelation was not only uncongenial but impossible, he must have preserved an almost complete spiritual isolation. To reconstruct such a life and personality as this is the business of a seer. And it is a task that Mrs. Wetmore has cautiously—avoided.

With less scrupulousness, the biographer might have allowed her imagination to fuse together the fragments at hand and presented a complete hypothetical picture. With less discretion, she might have admitted, as is intimated in the preface, trivial facts which would have made Hearn seem more human without making him seem more admirable. Hampered, therefore, by her virtues, the virtues of friendship, she has done little more than present an outline of her subject's life. Of the thousand pages that the two large volumes contain, only 160 are given to the "Life." Therefore the work might have been more appropriately called the "Letters," merely, of Lafcadio Hearn. It is in these that the significance of the publication mainly consists, and it is among them that the reader must look to satisfy that curiosity as to the man's inner image that an artist's work legitimately arouses. Mrs. Wetmore herself says that the abundance of the epistolary material has obliged her to "abandon all temptation to dwell upon his more human side, his humor, tenderness, sympathy, eccentricity and the thousand queer, charming qualities that made up his many-faceted nature." That one has omitted, merely for lack of space, all that distinguishes a biography from an encyclopædic summary will perhaps be considered an extraordinary

* "The Life and Letters of Lafcadio Hearn." 2 volumes. By Elizabeth Bisland. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statement. A large part of the slender "Life" is made up of charming, reticent autobiographical fragments left among Lafcadio Hearn's papers. Such color as the biography contains, however, is supplied, not by these pale, mystical reminiscences of Hearn himself, but by the wonderful narrative which his Japanese widow sent to his biographer, and which, or sections of which, Mrs. Wetmore has had the inspired judgment to present unedited. These passages are the intimate expression of one who has first exquisitely felt. They have the art and the artlessness of poetry. Hearn himself would have been ravished by their astonishing but apparently spontaneous felicity of phrase. This is Mrs. Hearn's manner of telling an anecdote:

"Now about this cat: while we lived near the lake, when the spring was yet cold, as I sat watching from the veranda the evening shadow falling upon the lake one day, I found a group of boys trying to drown a small cat near our house. I asked the boys and took it home. 'Oh pity! Cruel boys!' Hearn said, and took that all-wet, shivering creature into his own bosom (underneath the cloth) and kindly warmed it. This strongly impressed me with his deep sincerity which I ever after witnessed at various occasions. Such conduct would be very extreme, but he had such an intensity in his character."

"He was a man with a rare sensibility of feeling," she writes of her husband, "also he had a peculiar taste. Having been teased by the hard world, and being still in the vigor of his life, he often seemed to be indignant with the world. (This turned in his later years into a melancholic temperament.)" And she relates:

"When at Kumamoto we two often went for a walk in the nighttime. On the first walk at Kumamoto I was led to a graveyard, for on the previous day he said: 'I have found a pleasant place. Let us go there to-morrow night.' Through a dark path I was led on, until we came up a hill, where were many tombs. Dreary place it was! He said: 'Listen and hear the voices of frogs.'"

"Indeed, sometimes I thought he was mad, because he seemed too frequently he saw things that were not, and heard things that were not," she says, with beautiful simplicity; and thus tells how she herself supplied the material for some of her husband's ghostly studies:

"He put too much importance to Beauty or Nicety perhaps. He was too enthusiastic for beauty, for which he wept, and for which he rejoiced, and for which he was angry. This made him shun social intercourse; this made him as if he were an eccentric person. To him medi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tating and writing were the sole pleasure of life, and for this he disposed of all things else. . . .

"I used to tell him ghost-stories in dreary evenings, with the lamp purposely dimly lighted. He seemed always to listen as if he were withholding breath for fear. His manner, so eagerly attentive and looking fearful, made me tell the story with more emphasis. Our house was, as it were, a ghost-house on those times; I began to be haunted with fearful dreams in the night. I told him about that and he said we would stop ghost-stories for some time.

"When I tell him stories I always told him at first the mere skeleton of the story. If it is interesting, he puts it down in his note-book and makes me repeat and repeat several times.

"And when the story is interesting, he instantly becomes exceedingly serious; the color of his face changes; his eyes wear the look of fearful enthusiasm."

Which is, of course, biography of the most enthralling order.

An estimate of the "Letters" is perhaps the part of the psychologist rather than of the reviewer. They are not familiar letters. Not one of them paints the man himself as startlingly as a single sentence of his foreign wife's irresistible eloquence. But of the artist they give a fairly complete and a really absorbing history. It is important that every word of them confirms his wife's testimony of Hearn's "deep sincerity"; he was incapable of pose. His temperament was so far removed from that of the egoist that not under the most fortunate circumstances could he conceivably have been other than modest and fastidiously self-critical. But it is pitiful to read that a man of such rare and positive gifts should have had, to the very end of his life, such an embittering fight for subsistence, so little of that soothing balm of success with which hundreds of lesser authors were busily anointing themselves. His lack of egoism, however, made it possible for him to have a keen and tender understanding of other men. It is subtly evident, in each of his letters to his friends, that he was addressing himself to a human being that he definitely and sympathetically understood; it was not his practice to write down a graceful expression of a mood and address the envelope at random,—a selflessness, of course, rare in correspondence of so high a literary order.

During many years, beginning with the time that Hearn left reporting in Cincinnati to live in New Orleans, he wrote constantly and copiously to H. E. Krehbiel, then also beginning his career. These very winning letters are of singular value in de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

picting, without vanity or self-consciousness, a writer's intellectual youth. Both the divine unrest and the eager industry of the genuine artist are wonderfully set down in them. In a sense Hearn was chiefly, as he said of himself, a "word-artist." And it is certainly true that he was not, as Mrs. Wetmore claims for him, a "great man." He was never an originator or creator, and if there be a class of men to be contemptuously dismissed as "stylists," he probably belongs to it. But what genius he had lay in his poetic sensibility; it was his distinction that, as he said of the Japanese, he "saw the world beautifully," and told, with peculiar magic, what he saw. He cared devoutly for the phrase because he could not endure that it should not suit its content. In his youthful period he wrote: "I shall always be more or less Arabesque—covering my whole edifice with intricate designs, serrating my arches, and engraving mysticisms above the portals. . . . I shall try to be at once voluptuous and elegant, like a colonnade in the mosque of Cordova."

The letters that make up the second volume cover the last fifteen years of Hearn's life, spent in Japan. Of the development of his thought during part of this period the letters to Professor Basil Chamberlain give a singularly interesting history; interesting if they merely served to relate the sudden and extraordinary influence of Herbert Spencer upon a mind up to that time almost exclusively prepossessed by the fantastic and strange. Of supreme interest, because of his extraordinarily delicate sensibility, are his personal impressions of Japan, to which his marriage with a young samurai lady and the establishment of a household containing all her near relatives, intimately introduced him. Quite unconsciously, his letters show the tenderness with which the harassed man fulfilled these heavy domestic responsibilities, which he appears to have accepted fully in the Oriental spirit. The strongest personal emotion ever manifested in the correspondence is that aroused by the birth of his first son, Kazuo, who was always afterward a passion and a feverish anxiety.

Toward Japanese women, "in whom all the possibilities of the race for goodness seem to be concentrated," Hearn's admiring attitude seems to have remained constant. But his feeling, doubtless slightly influenced by his conviction that Japan "despitefully used him," altered radically toward the country itself and toward

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Japanese men. In 1890 he wrote to Mrs. Wetmore: "I feel indescribably toward Japan. . . . What I love in Japan is the Japanese. . . . There is nothing in the world approaching the naïve natural charm of them. . . . *We* are the barbarians! I do not merely *think* these things; I am as sure of them as death." Five years later he said: "You can't imagine my feeling of reaction in the matter of Japanese psychology. It seems as if everything had quite suddenly become clear to me, and utterly void of emotional interest: a race primitive as the Etruscan before Rome was, or more so, adopting the practices of a larger civilization under compulsion—five thousand years at least emotionally behind us—yet able to suggest to us the existence of feelings and ideals which do not exist but are simulated by something infinitely simpler." And, at the same period: "I feel unhappy at being in the company of a cultivated Japanese for more than an hour at a time. After the first charm of formality is over, the man becomes ice—or else suddenly drifts away from you into his own world, far from ours as the star Rephan."

These volumes are indeed the story of a man "teased by the hard world." OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

GEORGE SYLVESTER VIERECK.*

IF "A Game at Love and Other Plays" were all that Mr. Viereck had to his credit, it would hardly seem necessary to write about him in these pages; for these little plays, cynically catching life at some unnatural angle, as they do, and cleverly, even brilliantly, done as they are, scarcely amount to a *raison d'être*. If one did not see the poet through the plays, and know something of Mr. Viereck's other work and his acknowledged remarkable gifts, we should dismiss these plays as little more than smart pathological charades. For, indeed, they are little else; and, whatever the irony or other philosophy, of the situations—Mr. Viereck, with all his precocity, seems hardly aware how long we have been accustomed to such irony and such philosophy, even unto the sickness of death—we should pay no attention to them were it not for the unmistakable presence of an original mind, and an exceptionally forcible and magnetic literary gift. Their subject-matter and method, to a great degree, have come of an ardent boyish discipleship to two modern schools of drama,—the bacterio-

* "A Game at Love and Other Plays" (Brentano's).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

logical school of Ibsen, and the paradoxical, sham-beautiful school of Oscar Wilde. When I say "sham-beautiful," I must, in justice to myself, explain that I only mean the words to apply to one side of that tragic man of genius, who was so fantastic a blending of the true and the false prophet. Despite all his vagaries and affectations, he was at heart a true lover of beauty, as his poems and his fairy-tales bear witness. Here was the vital sincerity which gave force even to his insincerities, but this, naturally, is just what his imitators cannot copy. They can but reproduce the mannerisms of his Corinthian prose, and the stencilled arabesques of "Salome"—the present vogue of which, I confess, I cannot understand. But, to return to Mr. Viereck, his plays also show evidences of the bourgeois influence of Bernard Shaw, that farcical doctrinaire of stale sociological philosophy, who has at last found his appropriate audience with those middle-class provincial minds who, like himself, are twenty years behind the times, but who fondly believe themselves in the van of daring thought, as they applaud this cheap-jack of an outworn rationalism.

The two plays in the book in which Mr. Viereck is most himself, or at least most successfully dominates his influences with his own personality are "From Death's Own Eyes" and "The Butterfly." The first is the tragedy of a woman of forty who has loved and been loved by a boy of nineteen. Before his love fades, she decides to kill herself, but, before she dies, she conceives the idea of putting his love to one last supreme test. Will he die with her? They drink wine together at their last meeting. In her own glass she has secretly dropped poison, and, after they have drunk together, she tells him that his wine is poisoned, too—merely to see what he will say and do. To her joy, he proves the truth of his love by his willingness to die with her. His willingness was all she asked, and she dies happy in his arms, just as her beautiful young daughter enters the room. The daughter is the characteristic dénouement of the play. Mr. Viereck describes "The Butterfly" as a "a morality." It is in two parts. In the first, "The Righteous Man" is lying on a death-bed of self-congratulation. He has done his duty by his wife, his children and his country. So he faces the end calmly. But suddenly there enters a "Chorus of Things that Might Have Been," pleasures he has missed, dreams he has foregone. "We," sings the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Chorus, "are that life which thou hast never lived, the deeper mysteries which thy glance never pierced. . . . We are the word of love thou didst not dare to speak. . . . We are the mystical children of dreams, unborn of women whom thou didst not love. . . . We are minutes and hours and years vanished while thou wert busy feeding the mouths at home. . . . We dance where the deep shadows are, we are the secret runes in the Book of Fate — the splendid consciousness of self that, having lived through all that is human, understands all. And because thou didst not know us thou must perish like a moth dancing in a sunbeam."

Inflamed by these visions of the earthly pleasures he has missed, the Righteous Man strives to rise, that he may live his life again, cursing the goodness of his life which, a few moments before, had filled him with such complacency. But it is too late. Death softly lays a finger upon his lips, and at the window-pane there flutters a butterfly.

In the second part we have the other side of the medal. "The Unrighteous Man" is dying, he, too, in a state of self-congratulation—for has he not lived his life to the full, drunk its cup of pleasure and power to the last drop? But presently there enter disconcerting forms, such as "Disgust," "Pose," "Ennui," "The Seven Sins," and so forth, who, in vivid symbol, tell him the real truth about his life, and reveal its hollow sensuality. And so, as the righteous man died longing for unrighteousness, the unrighteous man dies mocked by the spectres of his pleasant sins. As he dies, "out of the room of the Righteous Man comes the glittering form of the Butterfly. It flies in through the open window, touches lightly the brow of the dead man and flutters away." This is surely a very suggestive bit of dramatized philosophy, which no one need find cynical, except its closeness to the truth of life should make it seem so; and the skill with which it is executed, a skill which is present in all the other little plays as well, make one reasonably certain that Mr. Viereck has a future as a dramatist when he shall have worked through his *sturm und drang* period, and become a little broader in his humanity.

RICHARD LE GALLIENNE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG.

LONDON, *January, 1907.*

IT is rarely nowadays that one hears anything of Tariff Reform in England. A year of a Free-Trade Government seems to have squashed for the time all popular interest in a question that eighteen months ago split the country into two frenzied camps. It is true the Tariff Reformers still spasmodically insist that the last election was not the end of the world or an event of eternal importance; that the pendulum will swing again; that the painful experience through which their cherished policy passed last January was a birth-throe and not a death-throe; that no new movement at its initial presentation ever secured so favorable a reception as theirs; that the prosperity of English trade must be judged not absolutely, but by comparative tests; and that the permanent necessities of the Empire remain as they were before the "parish revolution" of a year ago. They may be perfectly right, but unhappily no one will listen to them. People are thinking of other things—of education, of the House of Lords, of Ireland, of the social programme. They regard the Tariff-Reform issue as dormant, if not dead. So long as the present Government lasts—and it has weathered the first critical year of its existence with unlooked-for success—Free Trade is as much the assumed foundation of the State as the Monarchy itself. When the next election comes there may be a revamping of the whole question; the Liberals, at any rate, will take care that every one who is not a Free-Trader is labelled (and damned) as a Protectionist. But the next election is five years off, and in the mean time the question slumbers. Or if its repose is disturbed at all, it is by the Board of Trade returns and the automatic jubilation with which the Free-Traders receive them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There have just been issued, for instance, the figures of the foreign and Colonial trade for 1906. They show an almost breathless expansion. For the first time in English history the total of imports, exports and reexports runs into ten figures—one thousand and sixty-nine millions sterling. Every prophecy that Mr. Chamberlain made has been falsified. Every test by which he proposed to prove the decline of English commerce has merely served to show its gigantic and increasing prosperity. I fully agree that figures such as these, dealing only with a single year, and considered apart from the general inflation of prices, the abnormal spurts in particular trades, and the relative progress of competitive nations, afford no scientific criteria. But the average man has neither the time nor the inclination to search for scientific crietria. He takes the Board of Trade figures at their face value and comes rapidly to the conclusion that they make the whole case for Tariff Reform ridiculous. He knows that instead of a year of ruin he has had a year of records; that unemployment was never so rare or wages so high or prosperity so pervasive or the business outlook brighter; and in this happy consciousness he turns a comfortably deaf ear to the warnings of alarmists.

When Parliament reassembles on February 12th it will be to find the question of the House of Lords one step nearer the edge of practical politics than it was at the beginning of last session. I am not prepared to say that the wholly unlooked-for collapse of the Education Bill at the fifty-ninth minute of the eleventh hour has greatly injured either the House of Lords or the Government. What it has injured is the cause of good education, and that is a cause which, unhappily, arouses little interest in England, compared with the theological and sectarian controversies in which it is engulfed. England will never rally round an Education Bill as it has rallied more than once round Bills abolishing class privileges or extending popular rights. There was as much support behind Mr. Birrell's Bill as any measure of the kind is ever likely to find, but it was not a really popular Bill, not a Bill that the people had in any degree convinced themselves was vital, and the House of Lords in making its withdrawal inevitable was not running counter, in my judgment, to a trend of opinion that could honestly be described as national. On both sides of the struggle the people have been much more

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasonable and conciliatory and anxious for a settlement than their Parliamentary representatives. Although it was the principal Bill of the session, the Ministry acted judiciously in not appealing to the country against its rejection and in not attempting to make it the starting-point for a crusade against the Upper Chamber. Nevertheless, for the Lords to wreck one of the leading measures of a Government that has only been a year in office, and that has behind it a majority great beyond precedent in numbers and enthusiasm, is a serious undertaking. It is serious if only because it draws attention to the House of Lords. Like all anomalies, the Upper House of the British Legislature finds that its best policy is to escape notice. When it begins to be discussed, its days are numbered; and unquestionably the fate of the Education Bill has forced many Liberals into insisting that the time has come to deal drastically with the Lords. I shall hope to return to this question again in some future letter, and will only here remark that the House of Lords as an institution is by no means so unpopular as it might logically be expected to be, that the country will never submit to single-chamber government, that there cannot, therefore, be any question of "ending" the Upper House, and that to "mend" it, to reform it, is to strengthen it.

But the principal Bill of the new session will be Irish and not English; and Irish affairs, as usual, are wrapped in a complexity which makes the education entanglement seem simple by comparison. For one thing we are now, as I write, within a month of the opening of Parliament, and no Irish Secretary has yet been appointed in succession to Mr. Bryce. Parenthetically, I should like to say that England has only one opinion as to Mr. Bryce's entire fitness for his new post. It is universally felt that if you were to place in one column the qualifications that go to make an ideal British Ambassador at Washington and in another column Mr. Bryce's qualifications, the two would work out to a perfect equation. But his departure from the Irish Office just at this moment raises a somewhat peculiar situation. We are on the eve of the introduction of a new measure for the better government of Ireland. That measure, I have every reason to believe, will prove to be a substantial grant of autonomy. If accepted and worked in the right spirit—and on this point American, and especially Irish-American, opinion will carry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great and possibly decisive weight—there is no reason why it should not provide a working settlement of the Irish difficulty for the next ten or fifteen years, and at the end of that time lead up to Home rule by universal consent. But a Bill so momentous, dealing with a country so intricate, is one that no Minister, coming fresh and innocent to the Irish Office, can hope to master in a few weeks. Instead, therefore, of Parliament proceeding at once to the consideration of the new Bill, it may not even be introduced before the end of March. This is from every point of view unfortunate, but no one is likely to suffer from it more than the Nationalists themselves. Things are not going very well with them just now. The discipline of the party is far from being what it was in Parnell's time, and at this moment it is seriously relaxed. Mr. William O'Brien has headed a formidable revolt against the tactics and policy of the party chiefs, and has just scored a remarkable victory. His influence has spread all through the province of Munster, but its stronghold and centre is Cork. One of the Nationalist M. P.'s for Cork, a Mr. Sheehan, was recently drummed out of the party and his allowance stopped. Instead of retiring into private life, Mr. Sheehan resigned and offered himself for reelection as an Independent Nationalist. Mr. O'Brien hastened to espouse his cause, and Mr. Sheehan was not merely reelected, but was reelected without opposition, the official leaders of the party not daring to run a candidate against him. But the matter is not going to end there. Two lawsuits have been begun to determine whether Mr. Sheehan has or has not a legal claim to his share of the party funds, and Mr. O'Brien promises that the evidence that will be adduced will prove "of greater public interest than anything in Ireland since the Parnell Commission." Besides this, there is observable throughout the country a curious political apathy; the relations between the party and the priesthood are not as harmonious as they were; the young men are not coming forward with anything like the old enthusiasm; and several new movements are on foot that have seriously undermined the party's influence. If anything in Anglo-Irish relations had any longer the power to surprise one, this would—that on the eve of a great measure extending Irish control over Irish affairs England should be without an Irish Secretary, and should have difficulty in finding one, and that the Irish Nationalists should be less

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

united and less influential than at any moment during the last eight years.

Another matter that is likely to be canvassed a good deal when Parliament meets is the New Hebrides Convention. Lord Elgin has not proved a success as Colonial Secretary. Natal, Newfoundland, and now Australia, all have grievances against him. Australia's grievance over the New Hebrides Convention is in substance identical with Newfoundland's over the fisheries *modus vivendi*. It is, broadly, that the Imperial Government, when negotiating with foreign Powers in regard to matters that deeply affect the interests of this Colony or of that, does not pay sufficient attention to local knowledge and sentiment. The complaint is an absolutely sound one. Newfoundland and Downing Street are this moment at loggerheads because no system exists by which Colonial representatives can be admitted as parties to Imperial negotiations even when they deal with Colonial questions of vital moment. The official papers published on January 7th showed that the Australian Government was not consulted while the British and French Governments were elaborating the New Hebrides Convention, and that it found itself in the end practically confronted with a *fait accompli*. The result, the not unnatural result, is an outburst of Australian indignation that finds free expression not merely in the press, but in the official correspondence between the Australian Premier and the British Colonial Secretary. Such recurring friction between Downing Street and the various Colonial Governments is a proof of how little organization exists behind the splendid façade of the British Empire. Happily, a Colonial Conference will be meeting in London this year. It could not do better than devise some suitable machinery for avoiding these unseemly squabbles. More than anything else I know of, they leave behind a legacy of dissatisfied ill-will that severely strains the bonds of Imperial unity.

POSTCRIPT.—As I close this letter I hear that Mr. Birrell has definitely accepted the Irish Secretaryship. He will, of course, have to resign ris seat and be reelected before he can be officially installed in his new office. His cleverness and humor ought to ingratiate him with the Nationalists, both in Ireland and in the House of Commons, while his ignorance of Irish realities will make Sir Antony MacDonnell more than ever the real ruler of the country and the dictator of the Government's Irish policy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ST. PETERSBURG, *January, 1907.*

"MEN of principle," Thiers used to say, "are dispensed from succeeding in their schemes; for clever men, on the contrary, success is an obligatory condition." Now the Russian Premier is nothing if not a man of principle. He is a Russian translation of the Roman Fabricius. His claim to notice is not founded upon genius or exceptional talent. Some of his coadjutors lay claim to that. The Head of the Cabinet is a man of integrity, he is wont to do that which he believes to be right, irrespective of the consequences to himself, and it is this quality that has stood the Government in such good stead during some months of a most serious crisis in Russian history.

Moderate men were glad of Stolypin's nomination, for he himself was moderate and seemed qualified to calm the fever-stricken population. He had taken office in a Cabinet almost every member of which was anathematized in the Duma; yet he had escaped opprobrium. The mud of calumny had been flung at the Government continually, but none of it stuck to him. Whatever the other Ministers affirmed was disbelieved, scoffed at; but Stolypin's word was always taken to stand for a fact or an intention. Hence, when, on accepting the duties of Premier, he issued a list of the measures which he would endeavor to carry through before the second Duma met, his promises were taken seriously. And he certainly has redeemed many of them in full, and tackled the remainder to the best of his ability. Thus the peasants have been rescued from thraldom, they have been made equal to the nobles in the eyes of the law; cheap land has been obtained for those farmers who had too little; liberty of conscience has been inscribed in the statute-book and realized in the Empire, and many other beneficent changes effected. In a word, much headway has been made, although achievement has not been equal to promise. And this is M. Stolypin's vulnerable point.

Among the relief measures which were to be passed during the short interval between the dissolution of the first and the assembling of the second Duma, a Ukase was foreshadowed abolishing certain penal laws which irritate the Jews without giving any perceptible benefit to the Christians. Much dissatisfaction was aroused among the reactionaries when it became known that the Government was engaged in drafting a measure to alleviate the lot of the Jews. Threatening letters were sent to the Pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mier. Open letters were published in the organs of the extreme right. Hundreds of telegrams were despatched from all parts of the Empire to the Tsar beseeching him to veto the Ministerial bill and announcing bloodshed if it became law. The emancipation of the Jews is treason to Russia, agitators exclaimed. On the crown a strong impression was made, because the most loyal subjects of the Tsar, those who still addressed him as their "Little Father" and promised him loyal support and ready obedience drew the line sharply here and hinted that no Russion Monarch worthy the name would "sell his people to the Jews." In the army, too, signs of dissatisfaction were noticed. The Cossacks protested with superfluous vehemence; priests and monks refused to credit the rumors; peasants and nobles implored the Tsar to stay his minister's hand. Is it to be wondered at that the Jewish Relief Bill has not yet become law?

M. Stolypin exerted himself almost to the utmost to carry the measure. He employed every means that appeared effective with one important exception: he would not resign his post. And by shrinking from that consequence he laid himself open to vehement party opposition. But it is doubtful whether any man, whatever his views, provided that he really bore in mind the well-being of the nation and was truly desirous of engrafting the representative principle of government on the nation would have struck out a course very different from his. For if he had tendered his resignation as an alternative to the ratification of his Jewish Relief Bill one of two equally undesirable events would in all probability have resulted: either the Bill, become law, would have been followed by serious riots and horrible massacres in Jewish districts, or else, his resignation accepted, a Government crisis of the most embarrassing kind would have jeopardized the assembling of the Duma and postponed the efforts now being made to realize constitutionalism in Russia. That was one consideration which weighed heavily with the Cabinet.

And it was reinforced by another: the relief which M. Stolypin's Bill brought the Jews was very limited and failed to satisfy even those in whose favor it was drawn up. From a large measure of enfranchisement it had been whittled down to an endeavor to equalize the rights of the Jews among themselves. Theretofore there had been a road for wealthy Hebrews leading to "surcease of sorrow," but none for the poor. Thus a rich Jew

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could quit the Pale of Settlement* and live practically anywhere. He could send his sons to the university, and once they took their degree there, they enjoyed the same rights as their Christian fellow subjects. But the poor Jew was legally bound to live and die in the Pale. Out of the Pale there was no redemption for him unless he contrived to evade the law. And that he very often did, first eluding the vigilance and then gratifying the cupidity of the police. The result was so demoralizing that it was manifestly to the interest of the entire population that the law should be modified and so framed that it might be easily obeyed and effectively enforced. And it was with that object in view that the first measure of relief was drafted. It opened a broad issue out of the Pale by means of a clause providing that every Jewish citizen who had finished his service in the army should thenceforth be free to circulate everywhere in Russia like his Christian fellow subjects. That would have meant lowering by at least one-half of its present height the Chinese wall that keeps the Jews apart from the remainder of the population. It was tantamount to gradual enfranchisement, and must have been followed in a short time by emancipation pure and simple. But that clause and a few others were soon after struck out, and what then remained was legislation for the poorer classes of the Jews.

The new bill would allow all Jews inside the Pale to engage in any trades they choose, instead of continuing to limit the number of legal callings; they would no longer be forbidden, for instance, as they now are, to earn their living by selling alcohol. It would further permit them to move about in the Pale without let or hindrance, whereas at present they are obliged to reside in the cities and towns there and may not settle in the villages. It would give them the right of farming land on short leases instead of prohibiting them from buying or renting it. Special trades would also have benefited by it. There are certain categories of Jewish artisans who, like the brewers, for instance, are qualified to leave the Pale and choose a residence in any city or town of the Empire, but who must live in some one place and may not visit other places more than a stated number

* Jews are allowed to reside freely in the towns and cities of a number of provinces or states which are therefore known as the Pale of Settlement. Those who are privileged,in consequence of membership of a trade's guild or a high grade of education, may live in most other parts of the Empire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of times every year; now these persons would receive the right of moving freely throughout the Empire as would all Jews who have legally left the Pale. Moreover, all who have already resided ten years outside the Pale would be considered free of the whole Empire and not compelled to return to the Pale, as they are if they cease to ply the trade which first qualified them to leave it. Such in brief are the outlines of the new bill which M. Stolypin set himself to pass, intending when meeting the second Duma to point to the claim of his Cabinet to be considered as a power for good, as an efficient machine for embodying liberal principles in working institutions.

But the frantic opposition of the ultra-loyalists on the one hand threw formidable obstacles in the way, and the strictures of Jewish critics on the other, damped the energy of ministers to surmount them. "If at least the Jews recognized the measure as a reasonable instalment," one of the ministerialists recently said, "it would be worth making a sacrifice to obtain it. But far from that, they scoff at it and ask jeeringly whether ministers fancy that it will gain them a single vote at the elections or propitiate a single Jewish adversary in the press or in the country." Nay, they have gone further and said: "if Stolypin's measure passes, it will damage the Jewish cause. For people will then no longer look upon remedial legislation as urgent, nor will there be any such glaring absurdities in it as strike the impartial student to-day. It is better that the anti-Jewish penal laws should be very bad than that they should be only bad." Well, under such conditions, a reforming minister is buoyed up by a sense of duty to do the right thing, but once the question of sacrifices arises, he will naturally weigh what he gets against what he gives. And in the present case the passing of the Jewish rights bill would, the Government thinks, be politically unproductive, absolutely barren. "Would it be right, then, to insist on its being sanctioned, at the cost of troubles in the country, massacres in the cities of the Pale and excitement everywhere?"

Lastly, as the Ukase fixing the elections for the 19th of February has just been issued, as the Duma will have assembled in a couple of months, and as the Jewish problem will never be radically solved by any Cabinet, by any body except the people's representatives, it is perhaps better to lay it in its entirety before the second Parliament than to tinker it piecemeal to-day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the really strong points of the future opposition will be their condemnation of the so-called field tribunals which have now been for many months meting out swift and severe punishment to "bombists" and assassins caught red-handed. Some four hundred criminals whose misdeeds were generally revolting have thus been sentenced to death since the military courts were first created.

The Government instituted the field tribunals, composed of officers who were empowered and, indeed, obliged to try every case brought before them within twenty-four hours and to have the death sentence, if pronounced, carried out within another twenty-four hours, unless they recommended the prisoner to mercy. The result is that on the one hand some hundreds of criminals have been executed, while on the other statistics show a gradual falling off in the number of political assassinations.

The Moderate Opposition pleads that the general feeling of the Russian people is opposed to capital punishment. And for that reason there was no death penalty in the penal code except for attempts to take the Emperor's life. After the murder of Alexander II, however, a series of exceptional measures of a temporary nature on the subject was introduced. In virtue of this law a disturbed city, district or province may be proclaimed to be under "reinforced protection" or "extraordinary protection," and then the Governor-General, if there be one, is authorized to send political assassins for trial before a military court. And that court must condemn the prisoner, if he be found guilty, to death. It may also, if the circumstances extenuate his guilt, request the military commander of the troops to commute the sentence. If there be no Governor-General in the place under "reinforced" or "extraordinary protection" then political murderers must be tried by ordinary courts unless the Minister of the Interior himself orders them to be brought before the military tribunal. And if the district or town in which the crime has been committed is not under "reinforced" or "extraordinary protection," no political assassin can be sent before a military tribunal unless two ministers (Interior and Justice) give the order. That system which was devised in the reign of Alexander III and is in vigor to-day, is condemned by the Opposition in the country, and will be also condemned by the Opposition in the coming Duma.

But they will urge against it, one of their Leaders tells me,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not that capital punishment is undesirable in Russia, but that arbitrary capital punishment is reprehensible anywhere. And as the law stands at present, it is most arbitrary, depending upon the variable sense of justice, the fluctuating strength of prejudice or possibly even upon the digestive organs of a military officer. For the tribunal itself has no discretion; it must pass a death sentence upon all prisoners found guilty.

It looks as though the coming Duma would do little else than oppose the Government. And even if the omens were less significant the presumption would still be strong. For there is a fatality in the relations of the Russian deputies to the Government. As wood is petrified by the water of certain lakes, so Russian political parties are made anti-governmental by the mere atmosphere of the legislative chamber, nay, of the Empire. Their principles and programmes may be essentially those of the Cabinet, their interests, too, may be identical with those of the Government, but there is some mysterious, irresistible impulse continually pushing them into the opposition camp. If there be any section just now whose political aims and maxims are those of the Tsar's advisers, it is the group presided over by M. Goochkoff and known as the Party of the 17th of October. Mr. A. Goochkoff, an enlightened banker and public man of Moscow, is a born partisan. His element is the arena. He is not himself unless he is confronted by a rival, an adversary or a deadly enemy. Before he found any in Russia, he set out for South Africa to fight against the British for the Boers. Since the revolutionary movement began he has been frequently to the fore, always in the thick of the combat leading some forlorn hope, now against this party now against that. And with physical courage he combines moral fearlessness. He can stand up and develop his views in an enthusiastic assembly where he is in a minority of one. He gave a noteworthy proof of that rare quality—rare among Russian politicians—several months ago when he protested against the projected partition of his country among the nationalities and tribes that constitute her population. In like manner he has published since then a vigorous letter in defence of the severe measures adopted by the Government for the maintenance of order in the country, and risked not only his own popularity, but the very existence of his party, subordinating both these interests to the dictates of his conscience. Well, the party

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of which this brilliant fighter is the moving spirit appears at present to be more concerned to occupy a position against the Government than with it. It is an opposition of men, if not of measures.

The consequence is that there is no party in the State ready to break a lance for the Stolypin Cabinet.

The Stolypin Cabinet, however, is hopeful, and goes to work energetically as though almost everything depended upon the exertions of the authorities and little upon the will of the constituents. It is not leaving much to chance and hardly anything to the folly of the adversary. Too timid openly to change the electoral law which it might have done without provoking a protest, it has obtained from the Senate a series of such interpretations of the law as amount to considerable modifications and in some cases even to repeal. The result is a number of angry protests, which could hardly have been louder or more justified had the electoral law been rescinded and a new statute enacted. The motive for these measures is patriotic; the aim which the Ministers pursue is admittedly desirable; but the means they employ are less efficacious than a new electoral law would have been, and equally difficult to reconcile with the principle of constitutional government. Of all these measures the strongest has been kept for the last: a couple of days ago the order went forth that voting-papers were to be printed or received for distribution only by political parties which have been duly registered. Now the constitutional Democratic Party, having approved in principle the refusal of taxes and of recruits to the Tsar, could not be registered. Therefore it may not distribute filled-up voting-papers. Further, a prohibition was issued to carry on any agitation whatever inside the voting-booths. This latter order is felt by the radical parties to be especially detrimental to their interests. For nothing was easier for them than to obtain the votes of unsophisticated people by the hundred. At the last election their agents lay in wait for the illiterate voter at the polling-booths, and, as they now express it, "afforded him valuable assistance in grasping the nature of his duties as a citizen," but, as outsiders put it, "obtained his vote by hook or by crook." What they really did was to give him a voting-paper bearing the official stamp which he—unversed in all such matters—regarded as his duty to deposit in the urn. Henceforth this opportunity will be denied them. "It is a ter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rible blow for the poor illiterate voter," the radicals exclaim. "It is a clever stroke of policy on the part of the authorities," is the comment of others. Most people, however, are agreed that the measure was really legal, inasmuch as voting-rooms ought not to be electoral battle-fields. The practical upshot of it will be to deprive the extreme radicals of the support of a considerable number of men who belong to no party and are easily led by the most enterprising.

And yet the Government is not certain, I do not say of a majority—for that is out of the question—but of such a reasonable businesslike Duma that legislative work of some kind may be proceeded with. Without claiming to know more or to see further than the average close student of contemporary Russian history, I feel disposed to set down the chances of such a Duma at twenty, as against eighty that the new legislative body will be so frankly oppositional that no permanent *modus vivendi* can be looked for between it and the Cabinet. And yet the bills and schemes which M. Stolypin and his colleagues are having drafted for the consideration of the people's representatives are numerous, radical, salutary. The entire commercial and industrial legislation is to be remodelled. At present everything that is not expressly permitted is implicitly forbidden. According to the new legislation everything that is not explicitly prohibited will be *eo ipso* allowed. Joint stock companies may be promoted almost as easily as tea-parties are arranged; the workmen's interests will be consulted and furthered; those operatives who are incapacitated by old age or accident will be provided for; freedom of combining against employers will be extended; tariff duties will be wholly abolished or greatly reduced on machinery not manufactured in Russia whenever it is required for mills, factories and metallurgic works, railways, etc. In a word, Russia's mineral and industrial wealth is to be realized.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

THURSDAY, *February 7.*

President Roosevelt as an Ally of the Money Power.

WE place no credence whatever in the story from Washington to the effect that the President has directed the Interstate Commerce Commission to devise a way to fix values of railways without regard to their capitalization and to reduce rates arbitrarily to a point which would yield only "a fair return upon the actual investment." Wholly aside from the virtual impossibility of untangling the multitude of threads composing the many skeins which now enter into these gigantic organizations, the unavoidable injustices involved in the inevitable consequences of such an undertaking are so manifest that no person, heedful in the slightest degree of the protection of property rights guaranteed by the Constitution, would dream of venturing so far along the perilous road to confiscation. Nor is there any indication that such a procedure would win the approval of the public, however deeply the unthinking portion may have been stirred to break in upon the accumulations of others instead of striving for accretions of their own. In his tentative advocacy of government ownership of railways, Mr. Bryan took particular care to confine the method of acquirement strictly to purchase at equitable prices and, even so, brought down upon his unsuspecting head such a torrent of expostulation that he promptly disavowed any intent of immediate action, and has since practically abandoned the notion altogether. That the meaning of an episode so full of significance should escape the attention of the most astute, as well as the most daring, politician of his day was inconceivable, and the fact that it did not was made manifest forthwith in one of the more important of his messages to Congress.

Overcapitalization is responsible, doubtless, for certain existing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evils, but it has also yielded benefits immeasurably greater. Any aspirant for political honors may win applause by condemning the practice, but every sane business man knows that without it we would have no railways to either applaud or attack. Capital has never yet been venturesome; from time immemorial it has encouraged stagnation by keeping rigidly within narrow confines unless tempted by hope of great rewards into channels of hazard. The projectors of the great Western railways, which have brought an empire of productive acres to the service of civilization, engaged in no certain undertaking; they chanced their money and the money of those whom they could induce into partnership upon projects which timidity would not countenance and whose success or failure spelt mighty fortunes or irretrievable ruin. Despite the huge losses that paved the way originally, the ventures of recent years have proved generally successful—a fact in which we should rejoice as having been the chief contributor to the prosperity of which happily now we are able to complain. To deprive such enterprise of the just rewards of the energy, daring and risk involved would not only retard but absolutely prohibit progress and would make drones of workers.

That President Roosevelt should be misled by the heedless demagogic spirit of the times into espousal of a doctrine so utterly foreign to the American idea is to our mind inconceivable; and yet we cannot escape the conclusion that a very serious situation has ensued from the manifestations of general animosity which have grown out of his determination to reform abuses. Billions of dollars are needed immediately for a great expansion of facilities to meet obvious requirements and, for the first time in the history of the country, cannot be obtained. Bonds of the strongest railway corporations in the world are a drug on the market, and new issues for pressing needs are not dreamed of. Instead of being able to fund obligations at low rates of interest, nearly every large railway company has been compelled to pay excessive sums for temporary accommodation, thus inevitably inducing retrenchment in expenditures when extension of facilities is the chief need of both producer and consumer.

Why is this the deplorable condition in a time of unparalleled prosperity producing the largest business, the greatest revenues and consequently the surest security ever known? Why are nine-tenths of the new and expensive obligations drawn to mature

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in three years, or only a few months after the expiration of the President's term? Surely none will pretend that the corporations pay more for money than they are obliged to pay; capital fixes the lowest price it will accept, and the borrower must pay for such time as the lender is able to maintain the rate. By unanimous consent that period seems to coincide exactly with the probable duration of President Roosevelt's authority. If, then, the constant menace contained in that authority be, as all signs indicate, directly responsible for an excess in interest charges, enormous in the aggregate, the impossibility of reductions in traffic rates becomes as obvious as the certainty that further increases in wages would engender bankruptcy, thus completely nullifying the very purposes the President has in mind.

May it not be the province of some one of his advisers to point out to Mr. Roosevelt that he is to-day, unconsciously, of course, the most effective ally of the money-lending power in the world, and bears a responsibility for a retrogressive movement surcharged with possibilities of disaster to the country and the people?

FRIDAY, *February 8.* A Suggestion to Secretary Root.

"BEFORE long America will be the centre of Esperanto," Dr. Zamenhof recently predicted in this REVIEW, "because for no region in the world does Esperanto mean so much as for the countries of America." Significant as these words are on their face, they are far more significant than even Dr. Zamenhof supposes. He, no doubt, had in mind the large polyglot conglomeration of races that makes up these United States of ours, and, perhaps, the numerous nations of Latin-America speaking Spanish and Portuguese, all of whom a common auxiliary tongue would tend to unite into that "brotherhood of mankind" which he has so much at heart. Undeniable as is the importance of that side of Esperanto, it has, however, for us another side equally important and of immense practical value.

Every one knows how seldom it is that our consular officers abroad speak, at least for some time after their migration to foreign lands, any language other than "straight American." And for this they cannot be held to blame. Foreign Consuls, particularly those from the Continent of Europe, have, in the first place, more facility in acquiring other tongues; and, in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

second, both by condition and training, more opportunity. And thus the American Consul, who is generally acknowledged to be the ablest of all, must be put to shame by the foreigner only because, being an Anglo-Saxon, other tongues do not come to him easily, and also because he is a practical man of affairs who lacks the leisure for linguistic study.

Now comes Dr. Zamenhof, of Warsaw, with an artificial language, so easy, so simple, so logical that a schoolboy can learn it in a month, that an educated man reads it fairly at sight. So abundant is its merit that some of the greatest scholars, as well as men of affairs, acknowledge it to be a peerless medium of communication. Within the short period of its existence hundreds of thousands of people have learned it, and their number is daily growing. Already we see that it is destined never to die off the lips of men. The human race instinctively welcomes and clings to what is good. It has accepted Esperanto. From all over the Western Hemisphere we have received letters from men and women who see the value and utility of Esperanto; and we have seen Esperantists gathered in hall bedrooms and in back parlors studying and teaching it without a thought of compensation, but with a zeal reminiscent of that of the early Christians in their cause.

Whole nations are rapidly becoming converted to it. In France, where there are thousands of Esperantists, a bill will soon be introduced in the Chamber of Deputies providing that Esperanto shall be taught in the schools. The London Chamber of Commerce has officially adopted Esperanto as a subject for its examination, and the London County Council has already authorized the formation of classes in some of its schools for the study of the new language. In Belgium there is also a strong movement to introduce Esperanto into the public schools, and in many other countries there are similar movements. Germany has two publishing houses devoted to Esperanto, and the famous firm of Hachette in Paris has a large list of Esperanto publications. Numerous learned societies have recognized it, and a number of French Academicians have already approved it. At the last Esperanto Congress in Switzerland at least twenty-eight different nationalities were represented. Mr. Joseph Rhodes, vice-president of the British Esperanto Association, says in a recent article:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Statistically considered, up to June, 1906, Esperanto was known to have penetrated to 31 countries, and 377 societies or groups were at work, Europe being credited with 349, America with 16—the United States having then 10 societies in 7 centres—Asia with 7, Africa with 3, and Oceania with 2. To give a census of Esperantists is impossible, but a recent moderate guess at their number is 300,000. There are also 31 professional societies or organizations using Esperanto for special objects, 28 Esperanto magazines, in which the national language appears side by side with the international, and 8 national periodicals containing a regular Esperanto column. Europe is, so far, the centre of gravity, and here the societies are distributed: France, 94; Great Britain, 64; Germany, 35; Austria-Hungary, 28; Switzerland, 22; Russia and Spain, 21 each; Bulgaria and Sweden, 15 each; Belgium, 14; Holland, 7; Denmark and Malta, 3 each; and Monaco, 1."

From these statistics it is seen that America's showing, in proportion to its population and importance, is far below what it should be. And yet Esperanto means more to us than to many another country. For, aside from its general value, to which we have already referred, we must not forget what it would mean to our representatives in Latin-America. Already we have reports of strong movements in favor of Esperanto in Chile, Brazil and other countries. Indeed, all nations would follow suit were we to introduce it into our consular service. And what a boon it would be to our Consuls to have a language which they could learn to read, write and speak within a month and through which they would be universally understood!

We ourselves are so thoroughly convinced of the merit and practical value of the invention that we unhesitatingly recommend to the Secretary of State a serious consideration of the new language, with a view to including it in the admirable examinations which he has already prescribed for applicants for consular service. It is fitting that America should blaze the way along a path of progress sure to be followed immediately by sister nations already partially aroused to the importance of the proposal.

SATURDAY, *February 9*. Why Casuistry Should be Studied by Women.

IT is a singular fact, affording occasion for interesting speculation, that in the extraordinary intellectual development of woman which has taken place in the past century casuistry seems to have been and still to be ignored by tacit assent. We use the term, not in its corrupted or secondary sense as indicating a mere

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

method of sophistical and unduly subtle reasoning, but in its original meaning as signifying the science which guides the human conscience in the performance of its duties. For this task the feminine mind, as generally understood by the judgment of men, seems to possess peculiar adaptation,—a fact clearly recognized by the ancients, who added "casuistess" to their vocabulary simultaneously with "casuist"; but there is no record of a woman having justified the theory, even while the science held widest vogue, and the word has now become so nearly obsolete as to be hardly found in any of our modern dictionaries.

The natural deduction would seem to be that some peculiar quality of the feminine mind constitutes a practically insurmountable obstacle to really efficient training in the art; and, frankly, while we hesitate to accept so distasteful a conclusion not fully enforced by evidence, we must admit that personal observation tends to confirm that view. We know many women whose faculties easily permit of primary reasoning, but almost invariably when hard pressed they reach a point where the logical faculty gives place to impatience at what is regarded as captious contradiction, and instinct prompts a quick leap over intervening obstacles to a congenial conclusion. The goal often is the same as that reached by the slower and more guarded processes of close mental application, but demonstration that it is indeed the true one necessarily rests solely upon the hypothesis of intuitive accuracy.

To this seeming deficiency, we suspect, must be attributed the common—by which we mean vulgar—remark that a woman's argument is restricted to the word "because." Such an assertion is, of course, a gross exaggeration, cynical to a degree and unworthy, from its very lack of qualitative discrimination, of one making the slightest pretence of sincerity. It is true, undoubtedly, that woman's inferences are drawn more frequently from inner consciousness than from the careful consideration of commonplace facts, such, for example, as have been established by wearisome statistics, but this is due less to her dearth of knowledge than to her abundance of information, which has so wide a range that specific application of any portion of it to the solution of a definite question irritates the mind much as a plaster of mustard inflames a constricted section of the body. After all, in such cases, results alone deserve serious consideration, and we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have no hesitation in asserting the supremacy of the feminine deduction, in so far, at least, as any problem of morals or conscience is concerned.

Why no woman is gifted with that indescribable and invaluable quality vaguely defined as a sense of humor we have never been able to understand, but surely adequate compensation is to be found in the greater keenness of her wit. Indeed, speaking antithetically, man has ever been so generally recognized as the example, *par excellence,* of sheer stupidity that even the contemptuous Elizabethan scholars did not take the trouble to give a feminine termination to the word "dolt." Certain writers have maintained that no woman could divine, without making direct inquiry, whether one is serious or whimsical, so one keeps one's face free from signifying expression; but is not this very fact, if such it be, evidence of her greater straightforwardness? Moreover, while it is undoubtedly true that most women lie about one thing or another from the time they enter upon what is termed their social existence, is not their comparative clumsiness in the practice of that art creditable rather than the reverse, affording, as it does, a clear indication of their natural inclination towards truthfulness?

We are constrained to admit that in philosophy and correlative matters the more sensitized intellect of woman has made little progress; hence the obsoleteness of "casuistess." Why, we cannot tell. The defect—for as such we must regard it, in view of the severe demands of citizenship—may be inherent and incurable or, as we prefer to believe, attributable to a condition of mind which has given rise to rejection of any trait which might be displeasing in the eyes of men. It is in the hope that the latter diagnosis of cause is correct that we venture suggestions designed to induce rigid mental discipline while the mind is still in plastic form.

We have the greater freedom in making such suggestions because of our feeling of certainty that, however deficient comparatively in reflective intellectuality, woman to-day is immeasurably superior to man in a spiritual sense. This means that she is stronger in resistance to pain or evil in any experience so crucial as to require the support of the highest-minded fortitude. Despite the effects of hateful modern influences, there still exists no authority in the world so powerful as the simple purity of a good woman, before which no erring man can fail to feel abashed.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONDAY, *February 11.* The Passing of the Deacon.

IT is a pity, if true as reported, that the office of deacon has ceased to be regarded with favor by members of the Protestant Churches in New England. Time was when the title conferred distinction and honor, and was sought with as great diligence as could be considered seemly by good and pious men. Once acquired, too, it wrought a marked, though unconscious, change in the demeanor of the possessor, who forthwith became graver and more chary of speech, except in saying grace at table and, in the really old days, at the beautifully simple home services known as "family prayers." But, as the spirit of irreverence gradually permeated unregenerate days, stories of uncouth humor were spun about the deacon as a central figure, comic papers depicted him chiefly as indulging on the sly a liking for a horse-race, and, all in all, the title continued to lose its former dignity and significance until now, as we are told, it is not only no longer sought, but rather generally avoided.

Although perhaps sometimes forgotten, it is a fact, scarcely surprising to those given to investigating the origins of customs, that widows are directly responsible for the earliest appointment of church officials of the class we have in mind. When the Apostles realized the necessity of providing bodily sustenance for those who were in attendance on their ministrations, they made the requisite arrangements; but apparently the distribution was unsystematical, and presently the Grecians were egged on by their widow folk to complain that the Hebrews were obtaining more than their fair share of the provender.

Whereupon the Twelve took counsel and decided that, since it ill became them as spiritual teachers to serve the tables, the appointment of certain brethren of good repute to superintend the business was in every way desirable. Seven were chosen—Stephen, who subsequently was famed for his faith and good works; Philip, another admirable man; Prochorus; Nicanor; Timon; Parmenas and the proselyte Nicolas—and they were designated fittingly from the nature of their task as deacons—from the Greek *diakonos* or its Latin derivative *diaconus,* meaning attendant, or one who serves. That these first members of the order performed well their work is evidenced by the fact that the widows ceased to murmur and by their own rapid advancement in authority, until some were permitted to preach and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

even to do miraculous deeds. To this day, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, deacons are ordained by the bishop and may serve as travelling preachers, solemnize marriage and administer the rite of baptism. In the Congregational bodies, they seldom preach, but often read a sermon in the absence of the pastor, and invariably distribute the elements of the communion. They are also supposed to act as almoners after the fashion of Stephen and Philip, and in some States are empowered to hold as trustees the property of the church. In the very early days there were deaconesses also; but, as the widows generally selected apparently did not enjoy being classified as "of mature age," the practice fell into disuse, although the order is still maintained in Germany, and to a limited degree by various sects in this country.

The office suffered much in the old country from the reprehensible conduct of a Scotsman of the name of William Brodie, a deacon in an Edinburgh kirk and as canny a rascal as was ever reared on oatmeal. It was his custom to pass the plate of a Sunday morning and then proceed directly to his wood-yard, where he would meet others of like sportive inclinations in gratifying his passion for the abominable sport of cock-fighting. In his professional capacity as "wright" and cabinet-maker he had access to warehouses, shops and the residences of well-to-do citizens, and there occurred to his ingenious fancy the idea of taking the impressions of keys in putty, making duplicates, and levying toll upon his friends and acquaintances while they were asleep. Sometimes his exploits were astonishingly daring; here is an instance:

"One Sunday an old lady, precluded by indisposition from attending the kirk, was quietly reading her Bible at home. She was alone in the house—her servant having gone to church—when she was startled by the apparition of a man, with crape over his face, in the room where she was sitting. The stranger quietly lifted the keys which were lying on the table beside her, opened her bureau, from which he took out a large sum of money, and then, having locked it and replaced the keys upon the table, retired with a respectful bow. The old lady, meanwhile, had looked on in speechless amazement, but no sooner was she left alone than she exclaimed, 'Surely that was Deacon Brodie!'—which subsequent events proved to be the fact."

At first Brodie was content to work by himself, but as his ambitions widened he selected accomplices. Robbery after robbery was successfully carried through, the rich of Edinburgh went

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quaking to their beds, the guardians of the law seemed powerless. And all this time the incomparable deacon serenely walked the streets of his native city, attended to his legitimate business, entertained and was entertained by admiring friends. Then there came to him the magnificent idea of breaking into the General Excise Office for Scotland, where large sums of money were stored. In this adventure he had three accomplices. All would have gone well save for one of those accidents which are the despair of criminals. While their work was in progress—they had already found some £16—Mr. James Bonar, Deputy Solicitor of Excise, hurriedly returned to the office to find some papers. The deacon, for the first and last time in his life, lost his nerve; he incontinently fled. The other men, hearing footsteps and discovering Brodie's absence, departed also. All might have been well still, for Mr. Bonar suspected nothing, but one of the accomplices, fearing detection and hoping to save his own neck, made a confession, and the game was up. But for a long time the deacon eluded capture, even staying some days in London within five hundred yards of Bow Street. From London he escaped to Flanders, and finally, through his own indiscretion, was captured in Amsterdam.

The trial which followed was one of the most celebrated in the annals of Edinburgh. Deacon Brodie conducted himself with perfect composure. A contemporary account said: "He was respectful to the Court, and when anything ludicrous occurred in the evidence he smiled as if he had been an indifferent spectator." The verdict was "Guilty." In prison he kept up his spirits, and when a friend visited him sang with the utmost cheerfulness from the "Beggar's Opera." On the scaffold he was still unperturbed. "Twice, owing to some defect in the adjustment of the ropes, did the deacon descend the platform and enter into conversation with his friends. . . . With his hands thrust carelessly into the open front of his vest . . . the deacon calmly took that step out of the world which his own ingenuity (he had made some improvement in the gallows' drop) is said to have shortened." Even after the execution there were reports that the deacon had "cheated the wuddy" after all.

Not even our happily versatile land has produced a scamp so picturesque or so thoroughly calculated as Brodie to bring his honorable office into disrepute. For the disfavor now said to at-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tend it in this country, we suspect the comic papers are chiefly responsible, although probably a searching inquiry would reveal that the widows are still somehow concerned in the matter, as they have been from the beginning. Whatever the causes, the fact, if such it really be, is, as we have said, a pity, for the office is a high and holy one, and has been filled by thousands of godly men in all ways worthy successors of Stephen and Philip.

WEDNESDAY, *February 13.* **Education, Personally Supervised.**

ONE of the disheartening experiences of parents nowadays is that of comparing the mere book knowledge of the modern child with that of the youth of a past generation. Doubtless we are all members of a family whose head received a prize at the mature age of five for reading the Bible through. That was a customary feat a generation or two ago. The average child nowadays is apt to be struggling at seven with the primary intricacies of reading. Was his father really so much better equipped for life by his swift skimming of a national literature? It must have been a severe discipline in spelling and pronunciation, but it would be difficult to believe that any of the history or thought of that alien and religious race could have been apprehended by the childish mind. The classic example, of course, of early bookish education is that of the poor little John Stuart Mill. He began the study of Greek at three. He began Latin in his eighth year. "At that time I had read," he writes, "under my father's tuition, a number of Greek prose authors, among them, I remember, the whole of Herodotus and Xenophon's Cyropædia and Memorials of Socrates; some of the lives of the philosophers by Diogenes Laertius; part of Lucian and Isocrates' *ad Demonicum* and *Ad Nicoclem.* I also read, in 1813 [he was born in 1806], the first six dialogues of Plato, from the Euthyphro to the Theætetus inclusive." During the years from 1810 to 1813—therefore from the child's fourth to his seventh year—he read, and took notes and reported to his father upon Robertson's Histories, Hume and Gibbon and Watson's Phillip the second and third, Hooke's History of Rome, Rollin's Ancient History, Longhorne's translation of Plutarch, Burnet's History of His Own Time, and the historical parts of the "Annual Register" up to 1788; Millar's Historical View of the English Government, Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, McBride's Life of John Knox and Rutty's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Histories of the Quakers. He also read for recreation Beaver's African Memoranda and Collin's Account of the First Settlement of New South Wales, Anson's Voyages, Hawksworth's Voyages Round the World, Arabian Nights, Cozotte's Arabian Tales, Don Quixote, Miss Edgeworth's Moral Tales and Brooke's Fool of Quality. It would fill too many pages to tell what poor little Mill read from his eighth to his twelfth year. He admits, nay, he insists, that he was not a child of particularly brilliant parts nor of retentive memory, but his education was personally supervised and, it would seem from his account, very strenuously supervised. John Stuart Mill missed a great deal of living by being so early immersed in books; and, perhaps, the present generation of rough-and-ready little citizens, stumbling over words at sight, are not to be pitied. But yet there is a great deal in an education, personally supervised. It saves waste. And, if the books we gave the little folk from the beginning were chosen for their content, instead of for their harmlessness, doubtless the stony road to learning would be much softened.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED